fornia
nal
ty

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/religionpolitics00crapiala

RELIGION AND POLITICS

BY
ALGERNON SIDNEY CRAPSEY

NEW YORK
THOMAS WHITTAKER
2 and 3 Bible House

Entered according to Act of Congress in the year nineteen hundred and five by
ALGERNON SIDNEY CRAPSEY
in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, Washington, D. C.

BV
630
C7

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SANTA BARBARA

Contents

	Preface	
I.	The State	9
II.	The Attitude of Jesus to the State	31
III.	The Democratic Church in the Imperial State	56
IV.	Jesus' Method of Government	78
V.	The Imperialized Church	100
VI.	The Subjection of the Eastern Church to the State	120
VII.	The Supremacy of the Church in the West	142
VIII.	The Fall of the Mediæval Church	170
IX.	The Rise of the National Churches	214
X.	The Relation of Church and State in the United States	235
XI.	The Commercialized Church in the Commercialized State	256
XII.	The Present State of the Churches	276
XIII.	The American Church-State	297

Preface.

The sermon lectures which are submitted to the judgment of the reading public in the following pages, were not written in the first instance with any thought of their ultimate publication. They were prepared by the author and delivered by him in the course of his duty as preacher to the congregation of which he is the pastor. Reports of the lectures were published in the daily press, which reports attracted wide attention, and gave rise to much discussion and contention. Because of this it seems wise to publish the discourses in full in order that the writer may be judged by the whole body of his thought, rather than by any selected portion of the same.

It was the intention of the speaker that these utterances should serve the double purpose of the lecture and the sermon: as lectures it was their main object to impart historical information, as sermons they were intended to rouse spiritual emotions and to inspire moral action. The writer is aware that he has not altogether escaped the dangers which follow upon the effort thus to combine the work of the lecturer and the preacher. He has, he fears, unwittingly, brought into the region of heated theological controversy, matters that belong rather to the clear, calm,

dispassionate department of historical investigation. His only excuse is that religion and history are so closely associated that it is impossible to treat of the one without reference to the other. Especially is this the case when one attempts to consider the relation of the religious to the political life of man. This subject must be considered historically or not at all.

In view of the discussion which has been occasioned by the publication of the 12th lecture in this course on the Present State of the Churches, it seems wise for the writer to devote a few prefatory pages to a simple explanation of the historical method as it is used by modern scholars in the investigation of historical phenomena in general and of the phenomena of religious history in particular.

Historic criticism, as a science, has for its purpose the discovery and establishment of historic truth. Any one who is at all acquainted with human affairs is well aware of the fact that one cannot believe all that one hears. Stories are told of what men have said and men have done, stories which, while they may have some basis in truth are yet so turned and twisted, so colored and informed by the hopes and fears, the prejudices and passions, the inaccuracies and exaggerations of the story tellers, that it is only by a rigid process of examination and cross examination that we are able to arrive at anything like a truthful account of what actually occurred. Every one admits that in the ordinary affairs of the world,

one must exercise the utmost caution if one would not be lead into error. If a man runs after every rumor and listens to every tale, he is sure to come to grief. A prudent man will not act upon any information until he has tested that information by a rigid method of investigation which will give him reasonable assurance that what he has heard is true. Every prudent man is, therefore, an historical critic. He is applying to current history the same method which the student uses in his study of the history of the past.

The law courts are engaged daily in this process of historical criticism. They seek to arrive at the truth by a rigid system of examination. These courts have by long experience evolved rules of evidence which guide them in their administration of justice. To be a perfectly competent witness a man must have knowledge at first hand of the fact to which he testifies. If he has not himself seen or heard he is not competent to tell. Not only must he have this first hand knowledge but he must also be, as far as possible, without prejudice or partiality; the character of a witness, his ability, his fairness, his moral integrity and his intellectual capacity must all be considered in weighing his testimony. Moreover, a witness, in certain circumstances, to be of value, must not only have a knowledge of the particular fact to which he testifies, but also of the relation of that fact to the general order of the world. An

ordinary person may be competent to testify that a man was wounded in a given part of the body and yet not be competent to say that the wound in question was necessarily fatal and the cause of the man's death. Before he is competent to give such evidence he must know somewhat of human anatomy and physiology, and of the effect of such wounds upon the life of man. He must not only be an eye witness, he must also be an intellectual expert.

Not only does historic criticism take into account the character and opportunity of the witness, but it also considers the nature of the alleged event. An assertion which falls in with the ordinary daily experience of mankind can be established by evidence much less cogent than is required to sustain a statement which contradicts such experience. We can believe readily the word of almost anyone who tells us that a certain man walked upright upon the land; we would examine much more searchingly the same witness should he assert that a certain man walked upright on the water. In the one case the witness is corroborated by universal experience; in the other case universal experience is against him, and of all witnesses, universal experience is the most convincing. What we call natural law is simply an accurate statement of this universal experience. From the earliest times men have observed that heavy bodies when thrown into the air fall again to the earth. An accurate measurement of the velocity

of the fall of such bodies gives us the Newtonian law of gravitation. We can test that law at all times and it never fails us. When once this law has become a part of our mental endowment, we can readily receive all that is in accord with it, while any violation of it appears to us impossible. All the wonders of astronomical science, beside which all the recorded miracles of the world are but as child's play, seem to us credible because they conform to this universal experience.

If we are told of a certain being in human form, born of a human mother, expressing consciousness in human speech, living a human life and dying a human death, we naturally predicate of such an one a human fatherhood as well as a human motherhood, for universal experience bears witness to the fact that everyone who is the child of a human mother is also the child of a human father. To overcome this presupposition which is established by universal experience would require testimony of overwhelming force. The burden of proof lies with those who deny, not with those who assert the validity of universal experience to establish a given fact.

Historic criticism simply applies these principles to the examination of historic documents. It is a well known fact that in the beginning the mind of man was not trained to accurate observation and accurate statement. Nor was he sufficiently acquainted with the course of Nature to be able to interpret rightly

natural events. His history was not the result of careful research, of painful composition and toilsome correction; but it was a tale told by the fireside and passed from lip to lip—growing and changing with every repetition. Primitive man was moreover unable to distinguish between the creations of his own imagination and the facts of the external universe. His dream by night was as real to him as his sight by day. He projected himself into the universe and made the world in his own image. The sun and the moon and the stars, the winds and the waves, the trees and the running waters, were conceived by him to be living creatures like himself, capable of joy and sorrow, inspired by hopes and fears, indulging loves and hatreds. The earliest literature of the world is the expression of the facts of the universe in general and of human life in particular in the terms of the undisciplined human imagination. This literature is sublime poetry, but it is not accurate history. The historical critic classes stories of this kind under the name of mythology. In the next period of human thinking man recognizes more clearly his distinct place in nature, but he cannot yet measure his own powers, nor be fully conscious of his own limitations. He is ready to ascribe to his fathers, to ancient kings and heroes mastery over nature which later experience will not allow. The stories which make up his history have only a general relation to the facts as they occurred. His fathers and his heroes are the

personification of race feeling such as race pride, race fear and race hope. Stories of this class, which have some basis in fact, are grouped by the historic critic under the name of legend. After legend comes sober history—when trees are trees and men are men and facts are facts.

It has been the sole work of the historical critic to thus arrange and classify historical statements. The Christian critic has not hesitated to apply this method to all history except the history of his own religion. And is he not in honor bound to use the same measure for himself which he metes out to others? And this is all that the present writer contends for in the 12th lecture of this series. He claims the right to investigate the facts of his own religion by the same method which he has been taught to use in the investigation of the facts of all other religions. He would be ashamed to claim for his own great religion what he is not ready to allow to the poorest religion of the world. If the literature and formularies of his religion contain historical statements, then those statements must be subjected to the process of historical criticism, and if we find there the elements of myth and legend let us not be afraid to confess that our religion like all religions has had its infancy and its youth, as well as its years of sober manhood. And the writer of these lectures further asserts that whether we, the Christian ministers, like it or not, the historical content of the

Hebrew and Christian religion has been and will be subjected to the correcting process of historical criticism and is it not better that we, ourselves, should do this necessary work rather than be forced to receive its results at the hand of strangers?

The true believer has nothing to fear from historic criticism. His faith does not rest in any given interpretation of history; for him God is God, man is man, Jesus is Jesus, the Spirit of Holiness is the Spirit of Holiness in the eternal now, no matter what may have happened in the past.

NOTE.—Before going to press the author desires to qualify a statement made in lecture 12, concerning Theological Seminaries. It is there asserted that these Seminaries are the only institutions of learning which do not employ the scientific method in the investigation and establishment of truth. This is true of Theological Seminaries in general, but there are notable exceptions. The Union Theological Seminary in New York, Harvard Divinity School, Yale Divinity School, the Divinity School of Chicago University, the Episcopal Divinity School of Cambridge, Mass., are all schools of scientific as opposed to scholastic theology and are doing work of a very high order.

The State.

The Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, lately assembled in the city of Boston, had as its guest of honor no less a personage than His Grace, the Archbishop of Canterbury. For the first time in history the primate of all England, the highest dignitary of the established church, has left his own jurisdiction, and has come out to visit the churches in the Dominion of Canada and in the United States of America. This visit is noteworthy, not only because of the gracious personality of him who made it, but more because of the political and religious significance of the event.

We hear from all who came in contact with His Grace of Canterbury of his simplicity of character, his personal piety, his gentleness and courtesy. He is without doubt a good man and an exemplary clergyman. But it was not as a good man, nor as an exemplary clergyman, that he was carried about in private palace cars, received the worship of the

churches and the adulation of the multitude. It was not Mr. Randall Davidson who had the chief seats in the solemn assembly; who was the guest of honor in the house of the President of the United States and sat at the right hand of the merchant princes of our land. All these honors were accorded, not to the man, but to the official. This man occupies for the time being one of the highest dignities in the world. He is the natural companion of emperors, kings, and presidents; he is titular chief of the established church of England; he has his palace at Canterbury and his palace in London; his official income is greater than that of the President of the United States. This Archbishop of Canterbury is not only an officer in the church of Christ; he is also an official in the Kingdom of Edward VII. He not only presides in the councils of the church, but as a member of the House of Lords; he has his voice and vote in affairs of state. This, his official status, makes his recent presence in our midst a historical object lesson, bringing to our attention in a picturesque way the fact that there are in christendom two institutions, the church and the state, which from the beginning of Christian history have borne a varying relation to each other. It is

to this constantly varying relation of the church to the state that I now invite your attention, not as a matter for mere academic discussion, but as of vital interest to our social, our political, and our religious life.

That institution which we call the church came into existence about 1900 years ago, and had its beginning in a province of the Roman Empire. The church took its rise just at that period when the imperial system had firmly established its sway over the Roman world. The Christian church and the Roman Empire are so bound together in their origin and history that it is impossible to understand the one without some knowledge of the other. We must, then, take a hasty glance at the history and constitution of the Empire before we can study with intelligence the history and constitution of the church.

The Roman Empire as it existed in the first century of the Christian era had succeeded to the powers and inherited the conquests of the Roman Republic. The Empire had, indeed, built itself up out of the ruins of the Republic. The rise of the city of Rome from republican simplicity to imperial greatness is the central fact in the history of Europe, if

not of the world. On the left bank of the Tiber, in the country called Italy, about 14 miles from the sea, are a number of low-lying hills; two of these hills, separated from one another by a narrow ravine, form the site of the original city of Rome. The beginnings of the city are wrapt in myth and legend. Tradition tells us that it was founded by the union of three or more separate tribes under the leadership of Romulus and Remus. These mythical heroes were of divine origin, and acted under divine guidance in selecting the site and laying the foundations of their city. From the very first the Roman people were remarkable for their piety, and religion was a function of the state. It is to this fact that Cicero ascribes the rise of Rome to world-wide dominion. "Let us," said this great Roman; "let us be as partial to ourselves as we will, Conscript Fathers, yet we have not surpassed the Spaniards in number, nor the Gauls in strength, nor the Carthaginians in cunning, nor the Greeks in the arts, nor, lastly, the Latins and Italians of this nation and land in natural intelligence and home matters; but we have excelled all nations in piety and religion, and in this our wisdom of fully recogniz-

ing that all things are ordered and governed by the power of the immortal gods."* The domestic and the public life of the Roman had each its presiding deity, and he ruled all his actions with a view to pleasing his gods.

It has been suggested by Goldwin Smith in an able essay on The Greatness of Rome that the city owed its military dominance to the fact, not that it was more warlike, but, on the contrary that it was less warlike, than the surrounding peoples. The conquests of Rome were due, not so much to the brute force of the warrior, as they were to the discipline of the soldier and to the sagacity of the general. It was, says Goldwin Smith, "the first triumph of intellect over muscle."† The fighter under the Roman rule was not a savage rushing at his foe with savage rage, and running away with savage fear. He was the member of a highly trained company advancing and retreating at the word of command. Discipline was the life, and obedience the watchword, of the Roman soldier. To be slack in discipline was a crime; to disobey a command,

*Cicero, De Har. Resp. 9. Quoted by Bacon in Essay on Atheism, p. 167. Lee and Shepard, Boston, 1868.

†The Greatness of the Romans Essay Goldwin Smith.

or to act without orders, was to incur the penalty of death. Both in military and in civil life the Roman was the first to develop fully the idea of law. The great word which he has contributed to the language of man is the word *lex,* or law. In the Roman system the will of the city was the rule of life.

The original government of Rome was monarchical. But even in the days of the Kings the monarch was not absolute. He was assisted in the government by a Senate or Council of Elders, and by an Assembly of the People. It would seem that the office of King was not hereditary, but was subject to election by the people and confirmation by the Senate. When the Kings dared to violate the laws and outrage the feelings of the people they were expelled from the city, and Rome became a Republic. We have the whole genius of Rome expressed in this word "Republic." It is *res publica*—a public thing. The life of the city and the life of every citizen in the city was a public thing; and it was the merging of the life of the citizen in the life of the city that created that public thing,—that *res*

publica which became at last the wonder of the world. In Rome the citizen existed for the sake of the city; not the city for the citizen. It was a corporation, a body politic, a real thing that lived and wrought on the hills by the Tiber. We owe to Rome our conception of the state as an entity, our reverence for law as a rule of life, our belief in the people as the source of power. The very word "people" is of Roman origin. After the expulsion of the Kings, the Romans were jealous, above all things, of the executive power. Instead of Kings ruling for life, they had Consuls elected every year. I cannot in this lecture discuss the details of the Roman Constitution. It was the growth of centuries, and its history forms one of the great departments of human knowledge. The seat of power was in the Senate and in the Assemblies of the People. During the early period of republican history the city was disturbed by the conflict between the people at large and the old families, called the patricians. The patricians were the privileged class. They owned the land, for the most part, on which the city was built; they alone were eligible to membership in the Senate; they alone could hold the of-

fice of Consul. Little by little the people pressed forward, gaining for themselves a constantly increasing share in the government of the city. In the Tribune they created an officer who could veto the acts of the Senate, and arrest the person of the Consul. It was this conflict between the patrician order and the people at large that brought about at last the fall of the Republic.

While developing her Constitution within her walls, Rome was extending her boundaries without. War, at first a necessity, became a pleasure and a pastime. The soldier at first a citizen, laying aside his sword for the plough when the campaign was over, became at last a professional who spent his whole life in the military service of the Republic; and it was this professional soldier who in time subdued both patrician and plebian to his will, and founded the Empire.

Absorbing first the kindred tribes of the Sabines and the Latins, the Romans pressed northward beyond the Arno and the Po, subdued the region of Cis-Alpine Gaul, and extended her borders to the foot hills of the Alps. By the middle of the third

century before the Christian era all Italy was submissive to the authority of the city of Rome. The wars with Carthage, a rival city on the coast of Africa, threatening for a time the very existence of the Roman state, ended at last in giving Rome possession of Spain, Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica, and the lordship of Africa. From this time until the fall of the Republic, the Romans engaged in the business of conquering the world, and were eminently successful in their enterprise. They subdued Greece, Syria, and Egypt. In seven years Cæsar so Romanized and Latinized the country we now call France that to this day we call France a Latin country, and speak of the French as a Latin people. The instrument by which Roman success was achieved was the army. The Roman legions were perfectly adapted to the work in which they were engaged. Discipline was their life, the camp was their home. Their general was their god and their father. The Roman legionary had no attachment to the city of Rome, no reverence for her institutions. The city he, perhaps, had never seen; of her history and Constitution he was profoundly ignorant. The gods of the city were not the gods of

the camp. It is hard for us in these days to understand how completely the gods were localized in the ancient world. Each city had its own gods; each tribe its own deities. But in the Roman camp were men from all the cities and all the tribes of the Roman world, and each had left his gods behind him as he had left his father and his mother. It was this bringing together of the men of all nations under the rule of Rome that brought about the downfall of the ancient religions. Men found that the gods of their city were not able to defend them, and so they lost faith in them. The belief that the power of the gods was local was fatal to the belief in those gods when a man was removed from his own country. The god of Syria could do nothing for the Syrian as he wandered forlorn through the sands of Africa. So the Roman legionary, who spent his life in the camp, had lost his residence in the city, his attachment to her institutions, and his belief in her gods. But, as religion is a necessity of the heart of man, he soon substituted a new faith for the old. He soon came to have a reverence, a love, and a wholesome fear for the Imperium of Rome. Whoever came to his camp

bearing the commission of the city to command came with the power of life and death. The legionary saw in his commander the incarnation of the majesty of Rome; and, as I have said, the Roman legionary found in that commander his father and his god. To that father and god he yielded perfect obedience; to him he looked for guidance; from him he received food and clothing; from him he begged the donative that gave a little pleasure to his hard camp life, and from his hands he expected the bit of land in Italy or the provinces upon which at last he might live in quiet and die in peace.

In this way grew up that religion, so strange to our way of thinking, which was the worship of the Imperium of Rome; which at last came to ascribe to the Roman Emperor, the commander of the Roman armies, as the incarnation of Roman power, divine attributes during his life, and raised him to the rank of an immortal god after his death. This was the religion, and the only real religion, with which Christianity had to compete in the first centuries of its existence.

While the Roman Republic was strengthening itself in the outlying regions of the world, it was with

still greater rapidity losing vitality in the very center of its life in the city of Rome. The century which saw the provinces of Greece and Asia, Syria, and Egypt come under the Roman dominion was also the century which saw the decay of republican virtue, and the failure of republican government, on the hills by the Tiber. Rome in the days of her republican simplicity was as remarkable for her domestic virtues as she was for her piety toward the gods and her devotion to the public good. The stories of Lucretia and Virginia tell of the high esteem in which the Roman held the chastity of his women. The histories of Regulus and Cincinnatus speak of the Roman as always ready to subject his life and his fortune to the interests of the city; and we have already heard from the lips of Cicero of his piety toward the gods. Now in the second century before Christ all of these virtues began rapidly to decay, and at the beginning of the Christian period had utterly perished. Of Rome it could have been said at that time what Isaiah said of Jerusalem in his day: "The city was full of wounds and bruises and putrifying sores. From the crown of the head to the sole of the foot

there was no soundness in it."* The chastity of Roman women became like the snakes in Ireland—non-existent. Men changed their wives, and women their husbands, as readily as they changed their garments. Adultery was a venial sin, and fornication a very virtue. For two centuries the only Roman women who attained to celebrity gained a bad pre-eminence by the excess of their vices. Instead of Lucretia and the mother of the Gracchi, we have Julia Augusta, Messallina, and Agrippina Minor. With the corruption of female virtue came the extinction of the family. Rome would have become depopulated if it had depended on the natural increase of its own stock. It was only saved from that fate by the influx of strangers from all parts of the world.

But the loss of civic virtue was more frightful than the decay of domestic purity. No American politician of the baser sort ever surpassed the Roman in making public office a private graft. The stealings of Tweed himself become petty larceny when we compare them with the robberies of a Lucullus, a Crassus, or a Cæsar. The Roman Proconsuls did not do their work in secret. They

*Isaiah, chap. IV.

robbed the world in the open day, by force, and not by cunning. The rich cities of the East became their prey, and there was no end to their spoil. In thus appropriating to themselves the riches of the barbarian, they were conscious of no wrong. Their cry was, "Woe to the conquered!" and long before Marcy they had formulated the doctrine that to the victor belong the spoils. Having in their power the wealth of the nations, they might well, like Clive as he stood in the treasure house of Delhi and took only so many hundred thousand pounds of that immense treasure, marvel at their own moderation. When Cæsar went as quaestor to Spain he had to borrow a vast sum from Crassus to pay his debts; at the end of his quaestorship he had repaid this loan, and had at his disposal millions of money, and yet Cæsar was probably the most virtuous and moderate of all the great Romans of his day.

The venality of the Senate was as rapacious as the rapacity of the generals. In the second and first centuries before Christ political power centered in the Roman Senate, and in the Senate everything was for sale. Jugurtha, the usurping King of Numidia, bought the Roman Senate as cynically as

Jay Gould bought the legislature of New York, or the great corporations the legislature of New Jersey. The Senate was the fountain of justice, and there justice was poisoned at its wellspring. The crimes of spoliation and murder went scot-free upon a money payment. Rome had, indeed, become a harlot whose every virtue had its price. The populace of Rome shared in the general decadence. Free bread and the circus had utterly corrupted the masses. The votes in the comitia were bought more openly than the votes in the Senate. The populace avenged the murder of Cæsar, not so much because he was a great Roman, as because he left them each a sum of money in his will.

But a still greater disaster than the decay of domestic purity, or the corruption of civic virtue fell on the city; this last overwhelming calamity was the loss of religious faith. The Roman in the first and second centuries before the Christian era had outgrown the simple belief of his fathers. The Augurs smiled at each other as they looked at the entrails of animals, or watched the flight of birds; the poets turned the history of Jupiter into an obscene drama. A crowd of strange gods and goddesses from the East came crowding into Rome, and thrust aside

the ancient deities. Osiris and Isis from the Nile, Astarte and Heliogabalus from the Syrian desert, were far more popular than poor old Jove, or rustic Ceres, or plain Minerva. This vast seething mass of religious decay and corruption stifled the conscience of Rome and left her a prey to the violence of her own passions.* Then followed the orgies of the later Republic and early Empire; when human nature, turning upon itself, put out the light of shame, and gave itself over to a sensuality that was neither brutal nor fiendish, but a sensuality of which neither brute nor fiend, but man alone, is capable; when his conscience is cast down, and his passions rule without restraint. The destruction of republican Rome was caused by the vast increase of ill gotten wealth, by the substitution of slave labor for free industry, and by the subordination of the civil to the military power. In the last century of the old era the end came. In that century power was rapidly concentrated in the hands of a very few men. The military chieftans occupied the position in the world then which the captains of industry hold to-day. Pompey, the conqueror of the East, representing the old aristocracy in the Senate,

*Suetonius, Lives of the Twelve Cæsars, *passim*.

Caesar, the quaestor of Spain and the leader of the Democratic party, together with Crassus, the richest man in the Roman world, formed the first trust,* and divided that Roman world between them. Crassus was killed in his illfated expedition into Parthia; and the Senate, fearing the rising fortunes of Cæsar in Gaul, and the triumph, in his person, of the Plebeian or Democratic party, roused against him the jealousy of Pompey, and arrayed these great chieftans against each other, in the hope that each would destroy the other and so leave them, the senators, free to rob the world at their ease. But the genius of Cæsar was too much for them. While Pompey was vacillating, Cæsar was acting. In violation of the Constitution, he marched with his legions from Gaul to Rome; drove the cowardly Senate before him; pursued Pompey beyond the Adriatic; and on the field of Pharsalia ended forever the power of the Senate and the duration of Republican institutions in Rome.

The Roman world, as it lay at the feet of Cæsar

on the night of Pharsalia, was a world without a government, a world without virtue, and a world without religion. And this man, Caius Julius Cæsar, in the far-reach and plenitude of his genius, became himself all these to the world. The word of Cæsar became the law, obedience to Cæsar the government, attachment to Cæsar the virtue, and worship of Cæsar the religion, of the world. Only *one* other personality can compete with the personality of Cæsar for pre-eminence among men, and that personality was not yet born into the world. In his day there was no one, far or near, to compete with Cæsar for supremacy. He gathered into his hands all the powers of the Roman republic. He was clothed by the Senate for life with the Imperium. He was the Imperator, Emperor, or Commander of all the armies in all the provinces. Outside of Italy his word was the only law; within Italy itself the Senate and the people were obedient to his will. As Pontifex Maximus he was clothed with all the majesty and mystery of the national religion. In his day Cæsar stood alone like a God,—an object of fear, of reverence, of love, and of hatred. He

was the state, he was the church, and beside him there was no other. He filled the whole horizon of the heavens, and men bowed to him as to a deity.

And when Cæsar died at the foot of Pompey's pillar his great personality did not perish with his mortal frame. That personality brooded for centuries; yes, it broods still, over the political life of man. Cæsar was the incarnation of the state. In him the old Roman idea of the state as a Thing apart from the people, was personified. It was a Thing mysterious in its nature and awful in its power. It had but to speak the word, and men must forsake their homes, their wives, and their children, and march away to leave their bones in the sands of Africa, in the forests of Germany, and on the mountains of Caucasus. This dreadful Thing could come and wring the last drachma from the hand of the peasant, and leave him and his wife and his babes to perish with hunger. This Thing could come into a land smiling with plenty and leave it a desolate waste. This Thing could enter into the palace of the greatest of the Senators, and he must follow it to the dungeon and to death.

The state as it was incarnate in Cæsar was the incarnation of death and destruction. But it had this great and necessary virtue,—it allowed no one to rob and kill but itself. It brought a certain peace and quiet into the world.

The state as a Thing was passed on as private property to the grandnephew of Cæsar, the young and beautiful Octavianus,—called Augustus,—who consolidated the power and increased the value of the property which he inherited from his great-uncle. In some respects Augustus is even a more wonderful personality than Cæsar. He was not, like Cæsar, a great military or literary genius; not, like him, a great statesman. He was a consummate organizer; an astute politician. But, because he was that Thing, the Roman state, he could speak his quiet word in his house on the Palatine and a man would die in the city of Antioch. He could issue his decree and a province would be laid waste by cruel taxation. During the long reign of Augustus the Roman Empire became firmly established in his person, and at his death passed on, as a matter course, to his adopted son Tiberius.

And here let us pause and marvel at this Thing, —the Roman state,—which, since the days of Cæsar, has been the ideal of the state in the world. The state is a Thing,—a corporation, a body politic; throughout the history of christendom for the most part a private Thing, the property of its chief office holder, handed on from father to son as any other chattel. This Thing dominated all other things and persons; having interests of its own which are not the interests of the people who belong to it. It can, and it does to-day, send its hundreds of thousands of men from their homes in Russia to perish in the fields of Manchuria. It can, and it does, rob the people to the point of starvation that it may build itself warships, and arm its soldiers with mauser and maxim guns. It can, and it does, take from the poor and give to the rich. It compels the peasant to eat black bread and sleep on straw in order that the Emperor may gorge himself with ortolans, stupefy himself with Falernian wine, build his golden house in Rome, and his marble palace in Baiae. All this the state as incarnate in Cæsar, and as it survives in the modern world, did and does. It does, indeed, prevent the peasant from killing and robbing the peasant, but only on condition that it

may rob and kill at its will. The Roman Empire, and too often the modern state, is simply the lesser of two evils. It substitutes despotism for anarchy.

Because the Roman Empire was this awful Thing; because it did hold in its machine-like hands the lives of men and the destinies of the people; because it did sometimes save the peoples from falling upon and destroying one another,—therefore it was that the Roman state, in the person of the Emperor, was worshipped as divine. The old religions were dead, the gods of the hills and the gods of the groves were driven each from his shrine by the growing power of the critical reason and the corroding power of the corrupted conscience. What was good and what was bad in man combined to work the destruction of the ancient faith, and for the time being there was no other divine thing for men to fear but the divinity of the Roman Empire; no other God but Divus Cæsar.

But just then another came to establish a new divinity, and to compete with Cæsar for the worship of the world.

The Attitude of Jesus to the State.

Seventy-three years after the death of Julius Cæsar, fifteen years after the death of Octavianus Cæsar, called Augustus, in the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph;* a carpenter of upper Galilee, laid aside the tools of His trade and went down to the crossings of the Jordan near Jericho; attracted by the preaching of a new and strange preacher, who was stirring up the people by his vigorous denunciations of the evils of his day, calling the people to repentance, and proclaiming the immediate coming of the Kingdom of God.†

The departure of Jesus from Nazareth in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar marks the beginning of a new era in the history of the world. With this departure Jesus began a public career, which, while it lasted only for about thirty-six months, was fraught with eternal consequences to the life of man on the earth. Jesus, as He turned His back on Nazareth and joined the crowd that was hurrying to hear John the Baptist, carried within Himself forces

*S. John 1–46.
†St. Matthew, chap. III.

that were to profoundly modify the social, the political, and the religious life of mankind. The acts and words of Jesus, which followed His departure from Nazareth, gave rise to a new and strange people, who, entering into the Roman Empire, gradually assimilated its better elements, and became in time the Roman Empire itself. Resting on the authority of Jesus, a new race of rulers rose up in the world, who, after centuries of conflict with the power of the Cæsars, supplanted that power, seated themselves in the chair of the Cæsars in the city of Rome, and from their seat in that city ruled a wider world with a more enduring dominion.

This effect of the life of Jesus upon the life of the world is the great mystery of history, and its mystery lies in its very simplicity. It is mysterious just as all beginnings of life are mysterious. The Christian world has been engaged for eighteen hundred years in trying to fully explain the mystery of Jesus, and is as far to day from any perfectly satisfactory explanation as it was at the beginning of the Christian era.

But the fact itself, like the birth of a child, is, if not the simplest, yet the commonest, thing in the world. The history of Jesus is the product of his-

toric causes. He was born in due time to meet a great opportunity. When Jesus left Nazareth to enter public life human society was ready for the greatest revolution in its history, and Jesus was the Man created for the purpose of inaugurating the movement that was to change the base of human life, making love instead of fear the motive of human action; resting all government upon persuasion and consent, rather than upon force, and so creating a new ideal for human endeavor. Human society was ready for this new civilization because the ancient civilization had done its work and was at the point of death. The reorganization of the Roman world by Julius Cæsar had only arrested the progress; it had not cured the evils that were sapping the life of the Roman people. Augustus Cæsar struggled in vain against the tendencies of the times. The lord of the world, who commanded all the armies of the Empire; who could waste a province or destroy a city; at whose word the greatest of the Romans had been put to death,—was not able to rule his own household, nor to regulate the passions of his own daughter. The failure of the imperial system and the corruption of Roman life manifested themselves most terribly in the imperial

family itself. A glance at the history of that family will reveal to us the moral condition of the Roman world better than a more general survey of the social life of the Empire. Julius Cæsar was murdered by the leaders of the Republican or Oligarchical party in Rome in the fifty-third year of his age. Though three times married, he left no children. His appointed heir was his grandnephew Octavianus, who with consummate skill reestablished the Empire of his uncle in his own person, and reigned over the Roman world for more than fifty years. At the beginning of his career, when he was twenty-three years old, Octavianus married for purely political reasons a woman much older than himself. This woman was Scribonia, who had powerful connections in the Republican or Oligarchical party and who was chosen as his wife by the Cæsar for the purpose of attaching that party to his own person, and so healing the divisions in the Roman state. Scribonia had been twice a widow, and had no hold upon the affections of her young husband. Within a year of his marriage Cæsar Augustus fell violently in love with Livia, the beautiful young

wife of Claudius Nero. Cæsar divorced his own wife, Scribonia, just as she gave birth to his daughter and only child, Julia. At his command, Claudius Nero divorced Livia, and then Augustus and Livia were married. At the time of her marriage Livia was the mother of one son, Tiberius Nero, who was afterwards adopted by Augustus, and succeeded to the Empire. This succession of divorces and marriages caused great scandal, even in the dissolute society of Rome.* But after this Augustus gave no further offense; his love for Livia ended only with his life, and she was his faithful wife for more than fifty years. But this marriage, if it brought happiness to Augustus, was the cause of far-reaching misery to his family. Scribonia, as the mother of Julia, could not be ignored. She was the head of a faction in the palace. Her daughter was married first to her cousin Marcellus, and, when he died, was given to the great friend and general of the Emperor, Vipsanius Agrippa, by whom Julia had three sons, Caius Julius Cæsar, Lucius Julius Cæsar, and

*After her marriage to Augustus, Livia gave birth to a son by her former husband. Augustus sent the child to his father, Claudius Nero.

Agrippa Posthumus, the last so called because he was born after his father's death. Caius Julius Cæsar and his brother Lucius were adopted by their grandfather, Augustus, and grew up under his eye. In them the Julian family seemed firmly established and the succession of the Empire secured for generations to come. But alas for the vanity of human hopes! These young princes died within eighteen months of each other, poisoned according to Roman gossip, by Livia, Cæsar's wife, to make room for her own son. These deaths left, as the only descendant of Augustus, Agrippa Posthumus, who was an idiotic maniac, and was afterward murdered, it is supposed, at the command of his grandfather, at the time of the Emperor's death.

The last years of the Emperor Augustus were blighted by a sorrow even more terrible than the death of his grandsons. After the death of her husband, Agrippa, Julia, the daughter of Augustus, then in her twenty-eighth year, was given in marriage to the son of Livia. This son, Tiberius Nero, was a man of sullen disposition, whose life had been soured by his treatment by the Julian faction in the palace. As the son of Livia, he was hated by Scri-

bonia, the mother of Julia. During the lifetime of the young princes, Caius and Lucius, the heart of the Emperor was cold toward Tiberius, and the son of Livia passed a number of wretched years in voluntary exile. After the death of Agrippa he was called back to Rome to marry Julia. Tiberius hated this woman, who had been the cause of his lifelong unhappiness, and he hated her yet the more because of her glaring infidelities. Julia had long been known to everybody, except her father, as the most dissolute woman in Rome. She abandoned herself freely to every passing fancy, and there was hardly a young man of note in Rome who had not at some time been her lover. Her husband, disgusted at her levity, returned into voluntary exile at Rhodes. Her father, still thinking her a paragon of chastity, held her up to laughing Rome as a modern Lucretia. When her iniquities could no longer be concealed, the revelation of her evil life came upon Augustus as a stroke of lightning. He shut himself up in his house, bowed his gray head in agony, and would not speak a word. He did not, however, shield his guilty daughter. She was tried and condemned by the senate, and sent into exile, and spent the rest of her life in prison on a barren island in the sea.

On the death of Augustus, Tiberius Nero, the son of his wife, Livia, ascended the throne. Tiberius at the time of his accession was a sour, disappointed man, despising the world over which he was called to rule. He left the government mostly in the hands of favorites, and lived for the greater part of his reign in seclusion, indulging, according to some, in the most shameless debaucheries, and, according to others, mourning austerely over the corruption of Rome. Suspicious of everyone, he caused many of the senators to be put to death, and his last years were the most wretched of his miserable existence. His death was hailed as a happy deliverance, and was hastened, it is said, by the act of his successor.

Now it was in the fifteenth year of this Tiberius Cæsar that Jesus of Nazareth entered upon his mission as the Saviour of the world. He was perfectly acquainted with the state of the world. Nowhere was the Roman power more odious than in upper Gallilee. The representative of the imperial government in that region was Herod Antipas, the murderer of John the Baptist. The attitude of Jesus toward the Roman state was that of horror,

of undying hatred and contempt. It is true that the allusions to the Roman Empire are few and obscure in the written lives of Jesus. His conflict was not so much with the Roman state as it was with the Jewish religion of his day. But that Jesus was fully aware of the terrific evils of His time, both in church and state, is evident from the whole trend of His thought and action.

When Jesus became conscious of the fact that it was His mission to set up the Kingdom of God in the world He had to consider the relation of His Kingdom to the Empire of Rome, which was already in possession of the earth. It is impossible that Jesus should not have taken the Roman Empire into account. It was the one great fact of His day. He met its soldiers, its taxgatherers, its officials, at every turn. He saw crosses on every highway to which the power of Rome had nailed the children of his people. He saw men everywhere living in perpetual fear of that wretched, miserable, lonely man in Italy. Through Nazareth passed one of the highways from Rome to the east, and Jesus must have listened at the khan to many a dark story of lust and murder brought by the traveler from the imperial city. His whole soul rose in revolt against

this system of government founded upon force, protecting sensuality, rewarding the guilty, and destroying the innocent.

The state as it existed in the time of Jesus was not divine, but satanic. When the temptation came to Him to become another Cæsar, and by the same method to take for His own the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, then He saw in that temptation to rule as Rome ruled by force and fear a rejection of God and the worship of Satan. And when, in the awful struggle in the wilderness, He put that temptation behind Him, He determined the nature of His own Kingdom; He prescribed His own attitude and the attitude of His followers toward the state then existing, and toward the state of all time. In this determination, made in the wilderness, to declare Himself the King of the Kingdom of God, the Master and Saviour of the world, and yet to do all this without shedding a drop of blood or destroying a blade of grass, Jesus entered upon a career which was sure to result, as it did, in His rejection by the Jews and in His crucifixion by the Romans. By the Jews the actual Jesus was looked upon as a traitor; by the Romans He was held to be a dangerous fanatic and madman;

and from the point of view of the contemporary Jew and Roman this estimation of Jesus was correct. The contemporary Jew shared with Jesus His undying hatred to the Roman power, but he did not hate it because it was power, but because it was Roman. What the Jew wanted was to seize that power for himself, to become himself the ruling nation, and to avenge upon the Roman the wrongs of the Jewish people. He wanted to break in pieces the nations like a potter's vessel, and to wash his footsteps in the blood of the ungodly. The Jewish conception of the Kingdom of God was the lordship of the Jew over the world, ruling with a rod of iron, leading the people captive, binding their Kings in chains, and their nobles with links of iron. Now to all this hope and expectation of the Jews Jesus was a traitor. He hated the Roman power, not because it was Roman, but because it was power. The whole system of the state as it existed in His day was, in the eyes of Jesus, evil and satanic. He had as His mission, not the curing of evils within the state, much less the mere transfer of the power of the state from the hand of the Roman to the hand of the Jew. The mission of Jesus, as He conceived it, was far more radical than this; it was not to allevi-

ate or to change, it was to destroy the state; to take man wholly out of its power, and so render it useless and unnecessary.

The teaching of Jesus undermined the very foundation of the state as it existed in the ancient world. The ancient doctrine taught that the state was divine; a holy Thing to be worshipped, sacred from the touch of man. Man existed for the state, not the state for man. Now Jesus asserted the sovereignty of man. He, the Son of Man, was greater than the Roman state or the Jewish synagogue. They could not judge Him, but He could judge them. In the estimation of Jesus, man, not the state, was the thing divine. Institutions are for man, not man for institutions. The state does not make man, but man makes the state. The state, instead of being a holy Thing, a divine creation, is a mere contrivance of man for temporary uses. Man was before the state, and will be after the state has perished. The state can be no better nor wiser than the men who make it and use it. At its best, it reflects human imperfection; at its worst, human depravity. In all ages the state has manifested, not the highest, but the lowest, aspects of human life. The student of history stands aghast

at the folly and wickedness of human government. The great criminals of the world have been too often the rulers of the people. The state is not from above, it is from beneath. It had its origin in fear. Men gathered together on the hills of Rome and built walls about them because they were afraid. If man had not been a savage he would have needed no walls. To-day the state has vast military armaments and costly war vessels because it is afraid. If man were not a barbarian, he would need no soldiers. Savage is afraid of savage, barbarian of barbarian, and so fear rules the world. But fear is a debasing passion. Fear engenders hate, and hate engenders fear; and these twin monsters, hate and fear, have been seated at the council board of the nations since ever the nations began to be.

It was the mission of Jesus to cast out the devils of fear and hate from the world. Men fear one another and hate one another, so they make war on one another. Jesus taught men to love one another and hope the best from one another. Man, in his childishness, dreads the unusual, and hates the stranger. In the ancient world every strange man was an enemy. The very words "stranger" and "enemy" were synonymous. The Jew called the

rest of the world Gentile by way of reproach, the Greek and the Roman feared and despised the outlying barbarian world; just as to-day the Chinaman cries foreign devil after every stranger, and the Anglo Saxon despises all other races,—especially if their skin is a little darker than his own. Now Jesus saw the folly of all this. He saw that man is not the natural enemy, but the natural friend, of man. He said: Ye have heard of old time, ye shall love your neighbors and hate the stranger. But I say unto you, love the stranger, and pray for them that make war on you that ye may be the sons of your Father which is in heaven. A military establishment was, in the eyes of Jesus, a most damnable expression of atheism. It was a denial of the Father, Whose love is over all His children. For fear Jesus substituted hope; for hate, love; for violence, gentleness; for force, persuasion. He carried the world from the physical to the moral basis. The weapons of his warfare were spiritual, not carnal, but were mighty to the breaking down of strongholds. The great distinctive doctrine of Jesus was,—resist not evil. There is no place for an army or a navy in human life as that life is manifested in the life and the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth.

If Jesus had no use for an army or a navy, he had even less use for courts of law. The administration of so-called human justice, which is a principal function of the state, was, in the eyes of Jesus, little better than a travesty of divine justice and a woeful waste of time and strength. The only persons who really profit by the vast system which goes under the name of law are the lawyers; the men who make law a profession. The lawyers make the laws, and afterward the lawyers dispute as to the meaning of the laws, and then lawyers interpret the laws; and so the vicious circle goes round and round.

For the courts and the lawyers of His day Jesus had unconcealed hatred and contempt. He said to His followers: "Agree with thine adversary quickly whilst thou art in the way with him, lest haply the adversary deliver thee to the judge and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily I say unto thee thou shalt by no means come out thence till thou have paid the last farthing,"—*not the last forthing you owe, but the last farthing you have. In olden times, as in modern, the law was an expensive luxury, with which

*St. Matthew, v., 25, 26.

it was the part of wisdom for the ordinary man to have nothing to do. Not only did Jesus condemn the Roman system of jurisprudence, but his anger was kindled to the white heat by the whole legal system of the Jews. This system of robbery was the more hateful to Him because it was sanctimonius. "Woe unto you lawyers," he cried, "for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves will not touch the burdens with one of your fingers. Woe unto you who devour widows' houses, and for pretence make long prayers."*

The attitude of Jesus toward the law was the natural corollary of His attitude to that other institution created by the law,—private property. The state exists in a great degree to protect property rights, and for property rights Jesus had very little respect, because property itself was of little value in His eyes. He looked with pity on that eagerness with which men accumulate things. "A man's life," He said, "does not consist in the abundance of the things which he possesses."† He said of the man whose barns were bursting, and who was planning to build new ones: "Thou fool! this night shall thy

*St. Matthew, XXIII.; St. Luke, XI., 46, etc.
†St. Luke, XII., 15.

soul be required of thee."* Covetousness was, in His estimation, a crime against the soul. The Kingdom of heaven was a Kingdom of love, and joy, and peace, not gold and silver and precious stones. To prefer a piece of land or a piece of cloth to peace of mind was, in the opinion of Jesus, the extreme of foolishness. Does a man sue you at law for your cloak, let him have your coat also. You will be the gainer by doing this. You will retain that most necessary condition of human happiness,—serenity of soul. You can be happy without a cloak; you can be happy without a coat; but you cannot be happy without a quiet mind. In so far as men follow the teachings of Jesus, just so far do they render useless that vast machinery by which men attempt to administer what they call justice in the world.

Another feature of the state that roused the wrath of Jesus was the insolence and venality of the office-holding class. The young Nazarene was amazed as he saw men running after and bowing down to their rulers in church and state. These officeholders were using the people for their own advantage, gaining glory for themselves by killing

*St. Luke, XII.: 20.

the people; growing rich by robbing the people, glutting their pride by lording it over the people, and for all this the people gave them adulation and worship. Men desired high place in the state, not that they might serve the people, but that the people might serve them. Jesus looked upon the whole office-holding class from the Emperor down as a parasite on the body politic, and He said to His followers: It shall not be so among you, but whosoever will be great among you let him be your servant; and whosoever will be first among you, let him be your slave.* Servants are useful and slaves are profitable; but as for these Emperors, judges, high priests, and what not, whom foolish men worship and call benefactors, they lord it over the people and exercise authority upon them, not for the good of the people, but for their own gain and glory, and, instead of being useful members of society, do nothing but waste and destroy, and are no better than murderers, robbers, theives, and parasites.

This critical, and even hostile, attitude of Jesus toward the state we learn, not so much from any direct allusion to the Roman power in the gospel

*St. Matthew, xx.: 26, 27.

history, as from the whole trend of His life and teaching. It was not a part of the plan of the Master to come into direct collision with the Roman government until He was ready. He was perfectly willing to throw to Cæsar, Cæsar's penny for the purpose of keeping Cæsar quiet while he went on with His work for God. But He would not for one single moment yield to Cæsar, or to Cæsar's minions, in any thing that had to do with His mission in the world. When they came and told Him to get out of Galilee because Herod sought to kill Him, He said with fine scorn: "Go ye and tell that fox, behold I cast out demons to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I am perfected;" or as a better rendering: "I end my course."*

It may be difficult for us to think of Jesus as in this critical and hostile attitude toward the state. We have thought of Him so long as a mythological being; we have talked of Him so long as metaphysical abstraction, and have placed Him for centuries out of the reach of human vicissitudes, at the right hand of the Majesty on high, that we cannot view Him in His historical relations without a shock to our reverence. Yet this historical Jesus is

*St. Luke, XIII.: 32.

the real Jesus; the Man of God, who founded the religion called Christian, and from whose life and teaching the institution called the church had its origin. Living at the time in which He did live, Jesus could not help seeing the Roman state in all its hideousness, and seeing, He could not help condemning. He saw Roman soldiers bringing in women and girls and boys whom they had torn from their homes in Armenia and Parthia, and were taking to sell into debasing slavery in Rome. He saw men chained in gangs being driven to the imperial city, there to kill one another in the circus for the amusement of the Roman populace. As He walked along the highways, He stood again and again beneath a cross and watched the death agony of some wretched Galilean, who had offended the majesty of Rome, and, after a mock trial, had been nailed to the cross and left there to die. Jesus, as He watched that writhing and cursing man, saw in this shameful death His own approaching doom.

If Jesus was a man, such as His history shows Him to be, and lived at the time when history says He did, then He must have seen all of these iniquities, and, having seen, He could not help condemning; and this condemnation led Him to conceive of a

society in which none of these evils should have a place; a society in which rulers should not lord it over the people. Where there should be no military establishments to consume the substance of the people, and be the instrument of their oppression; where men should not undertake to judge men, but should leave all judgment to the One Judge and Lawgiver. A society such as Jesus had in mind would not fear the thief or robber because it would value nothing that the robber could take away or the thief could steal; it would not fear the murderer, for the murderer could only kill the body, and could not reach the true seat of life, which is in the soul. We cannot understand Christianity until we come to see it as a reactionary movement against existing conditions. The Kingdom of God, which Jesus lived and died to establish, was to be all that the Roman Empire was not: a kingdom of peace instead of war, a kingdom of righteousness instead of injustice, of mercy instead of cruelty. It was the ideal of the great Idealist, the dream of the great Dreamer.

The attitude of Jesus toward the Roman state is seen most clearly when He Himself comes into direct relation to the state. On the last day of His

life Jesus stood accused of crime at the bar of Roman justice. The charges against Jesus were the crimes of treason and sedition,—of treason against Cæsar because He said that He Himself was a King; of sedition because he stirred up the people beginning from Galilee even to this place. Now the accounts of the trial of Jesus are most significant of his attitude to the Roman state. The gospel history tells us that, when Pilate asked Jesus whether or not He was guilty of the charges brought against Him, Jesus answered him never a word; and nothing that the Roman judge could say or do could break the silence of the prisoner.* It is true that the Gospel of John represents Jesus as entering into conversation with Pilate; but it is the opinion of scholars that the conversations and speeches of Jesus, found in the fourth Gospel, are not historical,—not the words of Jesus, but words ascribed to Him by the writer of the Gospel. The earlier and more historical accounts of the trial represent Jesus as maintaining perfect silence in the presence of Pilate. When Pilate asked if He were King of the Jews, He answered simply, "So you say;" to the other charges He made no answer at

*St. Mark, xv.; Accounts of Crucifixion in Gospels.

all. By His silence Jesus denied the jurisdiction of the Roman court, and refused to plead at the bar of that court. The instant a man refuses to plead at the bar of a court he renders that court powerless to try him. The court can punish the accused; it can send him to prison or to death; but it cannot try him. The whole onus of the punishment rests upon the court; the prisoner is guiltless of his own condemnation. Such action on the part of a prisoner is a condemnation of the court; it is a declaration on the part of the prisoner that the court has no jurisdiction; it puts the court on its defense. This is what Charles I. did when he was brought to trial; what the counsel of Louis XVI. did when the King was accused before the convention. In each of these cases the court was compelled to face the question of its right to try the prisoner, and it was that question, and not the guilt or innocence of the prisoner, that was the great question at issue. And is was this question that Jesus, by His silence forced upon the Roman governor. That silence said to Pilate: I refuse to answer; you have no right to try me. That Pilate felt the embarrassment of his position is evident from the gospel story. If Jesus would only plead, answer, and explain Pilate might

condemn Him with some show of justice or else have a reason to discharge Him from custody. The refusal of Jesus to plead made the question to be answered, not a question of His guilt or innocence, but a question of the right of Pilate to sit in judgment on Him. Under the circumstances, Pilate could do nothing else but send Jesus to His death.

This action of Jesus was not the action of a mad fanatic; it was the action of the greatest moral intelligence ever born into the world; it was the assertion of a fundamental principle of the Kingdom of God, in which judgment of man by man has no place. Judge not and ye shall not be judged; condemn not and ye shall not be condemned,—is the rule of the Kingdom of God. In obedience to this rule, Jesus would not suffer the judgment of man. He went out to die as a protest against the method by which He and countless thousands had been brought to their death by the injustice of the Roman power.

I have nothing to do in this lecture with the theological aspects of the death of Jesus. We are considering it simply in relation to the state which condemned and executed Jesus. And the death of Jesus is a condemnation of the state. It brought out as in a lime-light the full hideousness of what in

those days men called justice. It brings out as in a lime-light the horror of much that in these days is called justice.

As we look out on the world to-day with its vast and expensive military armaments, with its intricate and costly system of so-called justice; as we see its forbidding prisons and its degrading stripes; as we think of its gallows and its electric chairs; as we see the worship of earthly riches and worldly power; man lording it over man,—the question arises, Was not Jesus mistaken after all? Is not His judgment of the world the judgment of a feeble intellect and an unmanly heart? In making the cross, and not the flag, the symbol of human life did not Jesus strike at the very foundations of society? Is he not a dangerous man whose death is called for by the highest interests of the state? So thought the men of His day, and they crucified Him; so think the vast majority of men in our day, and they despise Him. Our only answer is that for ages the very best of mankind have seen in Jesus the manifestation of God, have found in His teaching salvation, and in His death redemption, and believe Him to be the Judge of the world. And further, we answer to all cavils against Jesus that we are at the beginning, not at the end, of the Christian era.

The Democratic Church in the Imperial State.

In the sixty-fourth year of the Christian era, about thirty years after the death of Jesus of Nazareth, the greater part of the city of Rome was destroyed by fire. This fire broke out in the Circus Maximus, near where the gas works stand in modern Rome. To the mass of the people this fire seemed, not accidental, but intentional. It broke out in several places at once. When under control in one neighborhood, it would blaze forth in another. Men were seen running about with torches, and fire followed in their wake. At the beginning of the fire no efforts were made on the part of the authorities to arrest it. Thousands perished in the flames, and the people were driven into the catacombs and quarries for shelter; women died in bringing forth their children, and the young and the aged, escaping the flames, perished from fatigue and exposure. It was the general belief of the people that the Emperor Nero was guilty of the crime of setting fire to the city. Nero had com-

mitted every atrocity possible to man. He had caused a large number of the chief citizens of Rome to be put to death; he had put away his wife, Octavia, and had made the imperial palace a shameless place; he had lowered the imperial dignity by making of himself an exhibition to be clapped by the people; having a weak voice, he imagined himself an Apollo, and, because he could write feeble lines claimed the honors of a Homer. He poisoned Britannicus, the son of the Emperor Claudius, while at supper with him, and coolly watched him die. Agrippina, his mother, to whom he owed his elevation to the throne, worried and thwarted him, and he caused her to be murdered in her bed. While Rome was in flames Nero crowned himself with laurel, played upon his fiddle, and imagined himself at the burning of Troy.* He would not allow the people to go near their houses to take away their goods, but looted the city for the benefit of the imperial treasury. Under the circumstances, it was natural that the people should hold the Emperor responsible for the destruction of the city, and the murmurs were bitter and ominous. To turn suspi-

cion from himself, the Emperor Nero laid the crime of setting fire to the city at the door of a class of people who were despised and hated by all the world round about them. This helpless, friendless people were made the scapegoats of the Emperor's crime, and were compelled to bear both the blame and the punishment.

The celebrated Roman historian, Tacitus, in the 15th book of his Annals, at the 44th chapter, gives an account of this infamous transaction in the following words: "Hence, to suppress the rumors, he (Nero) falsely charged with the guilt, and punished with the most exquisite tortures, the persons commonly called Christians, who were hated for their enormities. Christus, the founder of that name, was put to death as a criminal by Pontius Pilate, Procurator of Judea, in the reign of Tiberius; but the pernicious superstition, repressed for a time, broke out again, not only in Judea, where the mischief originated, but through the city of Rome also, whither all things horrible and disgraceful flow, from all quarters, as to a common receptacle, and where they are encouraged. Accordingly, first these were seized who confessed they were Christians; next, on their information, a vast multitude were convicted, not

so much on the charge of burning the city, as of hating the human race. And in their death they were also made the subject of sport, for they were covered with the hides of wild beasts, and worried to death by dogs, or nailed to crosses, or set fire to, and when day declined burned to serve for nocturnal lights. Nero offered his garden for that spectacle and exhibited a Circensian game, indiscriminately mingling with the common people in the habit of charioteer, or else standing in his chariot. Whence a feeling of compassion arose toward the sufferers. Though guilty and deserving to be made examples of by capital punishment, yet they excited the pity of the people because they seemed not to be cut off for the public good, but victims of the ferocity of one man."

This classical passage from the historian Tacitus is of vast importance to the Christian, because it is the first allusion to Christianity by any Roman or non-Christian writer, and reveals to us the estimation of Christ and his religion by a man remarkable for intellectual insight and humane sentiments. Tacitus was but a child when these events occurred of which he wrote some fifty years after, in the reign of the Emperor Trajan; and you will per-

ceive that he carried in his heart through all these years an equal horror for the wickedness and cruelty of the Emperor Nero and for the superstition and depravity of the Christians.

We learn from this passage that, within thirty years of the death of Jesus, the religion which He founded had reached the city of Rome, and His followers were sufficiently numerous and important to attract the attention and to arouse the fears of the imperial authorities. At that early date Christianity had shown itself the implacable foe of the imperial system. The rapid progress of the religion of the Christ is not exceptional in the religious history of mankind. Religious movements are always most rapid and powerful in their beginning; they are violent outbreaks of latent force; they have their origin in that mysterious region of human nature which we now call the subconscious region; that region in which human nature is in touch, not with the seen but with the unseen. Great religious movements are the earthquakes and the volcanic eruptions of human life. For the time being they dethrone the understanding and break through the rocky crust of custom. Under the power of a great religious emotion man becomes intuitive. He does not reason; he

sees. He does not act from habit; he is the creature of a great impulse. In the eyes of those about him, he is either a madman or a god. He is the destroyer of the old and the creator of the new. He rushes upon the world like lava from the crater. He is a consuming fire.

Now Christianity is one of the four or five great original religious movements of the human race, and of these four or five is by far the greatest and most original. In Jesus the simple human soul burst forth in all its splendor; the face of Jesus glowed with the light of pure intelligence; the heart of Jesus beat with the emotion of pure love. The very garments that Jesus wore radiated light and life from His person. The words of Jesus were living creatures, with wings to carry them to the uttermost part of the earth, having eyes to see into the very secrets of existence, to know God and man. Jesus was not so much the founder of a religion as He was religion itself. He was the pure, white light of truth. He was the piercing fire of unsullied love. He was a glowing flame of holy purpose, and all who came near Him took fire from Him. He was the source of original power to men. His life was the manifestation of the eternal. It

was as indestructible as air: sin could not touch it: death could not hurt it. Sin and death were destroyed by its presence. To understand religion you must understand religious men; and of all religious men Jesus is the King. St. Francis of Assisi and John Wesley are men of the same type only far inferior to this greatest spiritual genius ever born into the world; in whom the Jew found his Messiah, his long expected Messenger from heaven, and in whom the Greek saw in the flesh the very word or reason of the eternal God. When we stand in the presence of Jesus we are in the presence of destructive and creative force. As His follower, Paul said, in Him old things are passed away, and all things are become new. As we know to-day the estimate put upon the person and power of Jesus falls far short of the truth. He has, says Emerson, not so much written His name, as ploughed it into human history. We are all of us living in the era which He ushered in. Ours is the Christian Era, and the distinctive forces of our civilization are Christian forces.

The creative power of Jesus manifested itself in thought and in life. In the region of thought the personality of Jesus inspired a great literature, and

in the region of life that personality created a vast institution. When we say that the personality of Jesus gave to the western world the church and the Bible, we can by those two words measure in some degree the extent and duration of His influence.

Of the relation of Jesus to the Bible and of the Bible to the church, we are not called to speak in this lecture. We will only say in passing that Jesus is in no way responsible for that conception of the Bible which prevails in modern life. Jesus was what in these days we should call a higher critic. He sat in judgment on the Scriptures, discarded as useless the greater portion of the writings that had come down from the past, and interpreted the whole in the light of His own reason and conscience. The power of Jesus lay in the fact that He was not a scripturalist: He was a great teacher because He did not rest His teaching upon any book or books, but upon his own intuitive perception of truth. He said: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, . . . but I say unto you."* And the people were astonished at his teaching. "For He taught them as One having authority, and not as the scribes."† As for the New Testament Scrip-

*St. Matthew, v.: 21, 22. †St. Matthew, vii.: 28, 29.

tures, while these were inspired by the personality of Jesus, and reflect the spirit of His life and teaching, yet He is not directly responsible for them, as they were not written until long after His death. But, as I have said, this relation of Jesus to the Scriptures, and of the Scriptures to the church, is not germane to our present discussion, and I speak of it only in passing.

It may surprise us to be told that Jesus is as little responsible for the modern conception of the church as He is for the modern notion of the Bible. Jesus did not preach the church, but the Kingdom of God; and, so far as we can gather from the words of Jesus that have come down to us, the Kingdom of God was an inward relation, not an outward institution. Jesus cries again and again: "Say not, lo here, nor lo there, for the Kingdom of God is within you." All the illustrations of the Kingdom have to do with inward dispositions of soul, rather than with outward forms of government and verbal expression of doctrine. The Kingdom of God was to prevail through the glad acceptance of the sovereignty of God by the children of the Kingdom in their own hearts and over their own lives. The Kingdom of God was to come by the simple mani-

festation of its power and life in the world. It was to grow from the seed within the heart, and become a tree of life, yielding its fruit after its kind, whose seed was in itself; it was to drive out the Kingdoms of this world as light drives away darkness, and as heat dissipates cold. Jesus was a pure idealist, and His conception of the Kingdom of God, an ideal conception.

At the beginning of His ministry Jesus was all aglow with enthusiasm. He expected that the Kingdom of God which He preached would be accepted by His own people with joyful acclaim. He judged others by Himself. To Him the Kingdom of God was the simplest thing in the world. It was to love the Lord His God with all his heart and soul and mind and strength, and to love his neighbor as himself. To Him righteousness was the supreme good, and pure love the supreme motive, of life. Let absolute righteousness be the end for which man lives, and pure love the motive of all his actions, and the Kingdom of God is here, for the Kingdom of God is righteousness and holiness, perfect justice and burning love.

There is nothing more pathetic in human history than the sublime confidence with which the Prophet

of Galilee set forth these ideal truths to the men of his generation. To Him they were axioms,—the self-evident truths of the moral life. Their rejection by the leaders of His people filled Him with astonishment, indignation, and anger. Jesus had no patience with the coldness, the blindness, the stupidity, the wickedness of the men who professing to teach the way of God, would not see that the only way was the way of truth, of righteousness, and holiness. Finding that He could make no impression on the higher classes of Jewish society, Jesus turned to the common people for support. He found the mass of the people eager to listen to His preaching, but wholly incapable of entering into the spirit and power of His word. Sadly and sternly Jesus said of them that they were a wicked and adulterous generation; a stony-hearted, thorn-choked generation, in which the seed of the word of God could find no root nor place to grow.

But for all this Jesus did not despair of the Kingdom of God, for to despair of the Kingdom was to despair of God Himself. As in the days of Elijah there were in the midst of the national apostacy seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal, and who had not kissed him; so in the days of Jesus

there were a few whose ears were open and whose hearts obedient to the word of God. And in these few would the Kingdom of God be established.

Jesus saw very soon after the opening of His ministry that the preaching of the Kingdom of God was fraught with great danger to Himself. He read His own doom in the doom of the prophets that were before Him. He saw in His own oncoming death the culmination of the wickedness of His people. Their rejection of Him was their final rejection of God. So great a catastrophe did this seem to Jesus that He expected it to be followed at once by an equally great catastrophe in nature. The rejection of the Kingdom of God by His people was to Jesus the end of the world. There are no sayings of His better authenticated than those which He uttered concerning the coming of the last day when the sun should be darkened, and the moon should not give her light; when the stars should fall from heaven, and the powers of heaven should be shaken.* And there is nothing in all the teaching of Jesus that so proves His faith in the Kingdom of God as this belief of His, that the existence of the universe was

*St. Matthew, XXIV.: 29.

dependent upon the acceptance of His conception of that Kingdom.

And the church was simply the outward expression of this belief of Jesus. The church does not owe its existence in the world to any formal plan of Jesus, nor to any far-seeing design on the part of His immediate disciples. So far as we can learn from His teaching, Jesus had no conception of an organic body at all,—at least not an organic body of long standing. The only officers that He appointed were apostles or messengers,—men who were to hurry from place to place and warn the people of the coming of the Kingdom; and these men should not have passed through all the cities of Israel before that Kingdom should come. It was not a far-distant event; it was to happen in the lifetime of men then living. "Verily, I say unto you that this generation shall not pass till all these things be done."* It has been said that the Christian church rests upon the resurrection of Jesus as upon a foundation. But this is not true, unless we include in the resurrection the belief in the second and immediate coming of Jesus.

The Christian church had its historical origin in

*St. Mark, XIII.: 30.

a little band of Jewish men and women, who were drawn together by the common belief that Jesus, who had died on the cross, was not in Sheol or Hades, not in the underground region with the spirits in prison; but that He had risen from the dead, and had gone up into heaven; and that He was to come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead. Without this expectation of the immediate coming of Christ the church, humanly speaking, would never have come into existence. At first the church was purely Jewish in character and membership. When the need of organization was felt the church simply adopted the organization of the Jewish synagogue; in fact, the church was at first only a Jewish synagogue or congregation, differing from other Jewish synagogues or congregations by the belief that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah promised by the prophets; that in Him God had established His Kingdom, and by Him God would judge the world; and that the judgment of God was nigh at hand, even at the doors.

Membership in the church was then confined to Jews by birth or Jews by adoption. Only the circumcised could share in the coming salvation. If a man of another nation wished to become a member

of the Christian synagogue, and share with that synagogue in the hope and expectation of the coming of Christ in His Kingdom, then that man must become a circumcised Jew, and keep all the law of Moses. The first great controversy in the Christian church raged round the question whether salvation in Christ was national or universal; whether the essence of the doctrine of Christ was ceremonial or moral and spiritual. Under the leadership of Paul and other like minded men, universalism won the day, and membership in the church was determined by ethical, not by national or ceremonial, conditions.

The rapidity of the progress of Christianity was owing to the fact that already large numbers of men and women were looking to the Jewish religion as the one way to escape from the foulness and silliness of the prevailing religions of the day. It was no longer possible for decent and sensible men or women to believe in Jupiter, the adulterer, or in Venus, the courtesan, or even in Minerva, or any of the twelve gods of Olympus. The Greek Mythos was dead and buried beyond the hope of any resurrection. Still less could men embrace the vague mysticism, and practice the foul rites of the orgiastic religions of Syria, Egypt, and the East. Everywhere

men were looking to Judaism as a possible solution of the religious problem for mankind. The stern monotheism of the Jew; the teachings of the Jewish prophets, which were the common property of the world, declaring that righteousness and holiness were the essential attributes of God, and that by the righteous and holy only could God be worshiped; all these considerations drew men to the religion of the Jews as to the only religion which they could respect and reverence. But, while they were attracted by the purity of Jehovah,* they were repelled by his sternness. He was the God of the Jews only. He hated and despised and condemned men of other nations. His justice was partial, and His love was limited. The attitude of the Jew to the Gentile prevented the Jew from becoming a missionary nation. You can never convert a people whom you hate and despise.

But when men like Paul, Barnabas, and Silas came to a world that was hungering and thirsting for righteousness, and taught that the righteousness of God was not to be found in circumcision or uncircumcision, but in faith and love; that Christ Jesus was the wisdom of God and the power of

*The Jehovah of the prophets, not of the histories.

God; that in Him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily; that His unblemished character and untiring service manifested the true life of man, the only life acceptable to God,—then the people heard them gladly, and the new religion spread from heart to heart as fire spreads when driven by the wind.

The first effect of the preaching of Jesus in the Greek and Roman world was the moral renovation of that world. As soon as men heard of Jesus and began to worship Him that worship purified the heart. Expecting every day that Jesus would come with all His holy angels, they were anxious lest they should not be ready on the day of His coming. It is difficult for us to exaggerate the influence which the belief in the immediate coming of Christ had on the first generation of Christians, in the Roman, as well as in the Jewish, world. It came as a great hope and an awful fear. If Christ came and found them ready they would hear His voice, stand at His right hand, and enter into His joy; if they were not ready then they would hear not the voice of the Saviour, but of the judge saying: "Depart from me ye cursed into the fire prepared for the devil and his angels;" and they would be shut out from the Kingdom of God.

It is hard, I say, for us to comprehend this faith of the primitive believer. It was näive and child-like: the Christian waited for Christ as a child waits for its mother in the dark. And the hoping and the fearing kept the heart from sinning, and a desire for that holiness without which no man can see the Lord became an overmastering passion, leading men to even wild extremes of asceticism. Christianity, as we have seen, was a reaction from the prevailing religion of the world, and rushed from the extreme of sensuality to the extreme of self-mortification. Marriage was despised, and men ran away from the world to macerate themselves in the desert, to fast and weep and pray, crying day and night: "Have mercy, Lord, and take away my sin."

The preaching of Christ not only resulted in this moral reformation, but, as a further consequence, brought about, also, a social reorganization.

The Roman world was in a state of social anarchy in the first century of the Christian era. The imperial government had broken down of its own weight; the old Roman families, both patrician and plebeian, had perished in the civil wars, or had been destroyed by the jealousy of the Emperors. Base-freedmen like Pallas and Narcissus were the min-

isters to imperial vices, and the instruments of imperial cruelty. All dignity, as well as security, had departed from human life. No man could trust his neighbor. Women were betrayed to the lust of the Emperor by their own husbands, and men to his anger by their wives. The government was an irresponsible tyranny resting upon the military power, and the Roman was no longer a citizen; he was a subject. He was no longer governed by law, but by will. There was nothing between him and destruction but the caprice of a vicious man. The whole Roman world groaned under this awful degradation from which death was the only release.

Into this world of social disorganization the Christian religion came with its doctrine of the Brotherhood of Man. And this to the Christian of the first age was no mere phrase; it was the great fact. All men were equal before God, for all were His children. He was the father of the slave, as well as the master; the Father of the harlot, as well as the matron. The Christian church was simply the household of God, in which His children lived, and, as the love of the mother is strongest for the youngest and weakest of her children, so the love of God went out to those of His family who needed that love

the most. The church attracted to its membership the outcasts of Roman society; the spiritually halt and lame and blind came flocking in; the sick came for healing, and the weary for rest.

The Christian communities were so many little democracies scattered throughout the Roman Empire. Each congregation elected its own officers and regulated its own affairs. Within the church a man was a man, having the rights of man. The democratic spirit of ancient Greece and Rome came to life again in the Christian communities. But Christian democracy was not simply a revival of ancient democracy; it was an advance on that democracy. In ancient times the man existed for the sake of the community. In primitive Christianity the community existed for the sake of the man. The church was for the people; not the people for the church. The church was an organization for social service; not an organization for self aggrandizement. Office holders in the church were taken from the people to serve the people. To the Christian church we owe that conception of government which is the underlying conception of modern times, and which found its perfect expression in the immortal words of Lincoln: "Government of the people, for the peo-

ple, by the people," describes to a word the government of the Christian communities in the first and second centuries of the Christian era.

Between these democratic churches and the imperial state there could be nothing but deadly hostility. The imperial government feared, hated, and despised the churches; feared them because it had a vague misgiving that the church was undermining the foundations of the Empire. The government hated the Christians because the Christians held aloof from all political affairs, and would not join in the worship of the state. And finally, the rulers of the Empire despised the church because the church was made up for the most part of the off-scouring of the Roman world. A society of slaves, and thieves and harlots was beneath the contempt of a Roman gentleman, and we have seen in the historian Tacitus an example of the attitude of the ordinary Roman to the Christian of his day.

And if the Empire feared, hated, and despised the church, the church looked upon the Empire with horror. It saw in the Empire organized rebellion against God, and it expected every day to see the Empire go down before the wrath of God. In the book of Revelation you can read the judgment of the church upon the Roman world. It was the beast

risen up out of the sea; it was the mouth speaking blasphemies; it was Babylon the great, the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth. The only hope of the world lay in the destruction of the Empire. And the Christian expected that destruction by an immediate act of God. So wicked was that old world in the eyes of the Christian, that the earth itself and the sky above it were involved in the guilt of man. Nothing but the annihilation of the whole present order could cure the evil of the times. So the Christian looked for the speedy coming of a day when the elements should melt with fervent heat, and the heavens and the earth then existing should be burnt with fire, and from their ashes should rise a new heaven and a new earth, in which righteousness should dwell.*

We know that the Christian was mistaken in his belief that the visible universe would be destroyed because of the sin of man. But his mistake was an illusion, not a delusion. That old world was perishing, burning itself up in the fires of its own wickedness; and out of its ashes a new world was rising. The Christian church was itself the new heaven and the new earth, in which dwelleth righteousness.

---

*II. Peter, III.: 10, 11.

Jesus' Method of Government.

In the year 130 of the Christian era the Jewish people throughout the world were thrown into a state of wild excitement by the glad tidings that the long-expected Messiah was come at last. He had unfolded the standard of Jehovah over the ruins of Jerusalem, and the Jews were gathering around that standard by the tens of thousands. The news of the coming of Messiah found the more eager acceptance because the affairs of the Jews were in a desperate condition. The prophecy of Jesus on the hill of Olivet, which He spake against Jerusalem, had been literally fulfilled. Looking down on the city, He is reported to have said: "For the days shall come upon thee when thine enemies shall cast up a bank about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall dash thee to the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one

stone upon another, because thou knowest not the time of thy visitation."* These words so exactly describe the condition of Jerusalem, in the year 70, after the siege by Titus, that one cannot help feeling that the words of the evangelist, ascribed to Jesus, which were written after the fall of Jerusalem, were colored by the event itself. Jesus foresaw the doom of the city, and wept over it, but it is not likely that He foresaw that doom in all its particulars and horrors. The Jewish wars, waged at the end of the sixth decade of the first century were among the most frightful in the history of human warfare. The Jews were inspired with religious enthusiasm, and fought with the desperateness of fanatics. Every hill in Judea and Galilee became a fortress; every valley, a battle field; city after city was taken by storm and sacked by the Roman soldiery. The siege of Jerusalem lasted for years, and was attended with horrors that disgrace the name of man. Every abomination conceivable was committed within and without the city. Cannibalism, rape, and murder were among the incidents of that siege. When the city was taken by storm the Romans had to fight their way from house to house, and from

*St. Luke, XIX.: 43, 44. R. V.

street to street. The final calamity was the burning and falling of the Temple. With the fall of Jerusalem the Jewish people were utterly prostrate under the power of the Roman. According to the estimate of the Jewish historian Josephus, 1,356,460 Jews were killed in these wars, and 101,700 were carried into captivity.* For sixty years the Jews waited in sullen despair for God to avenge their wrongs and to give them back their holy city and the land of their fathers.

At the end of the sixty years the word was passed from lip to lip that the day of vengeance had come. Akiba, the wisest and holiest of the rabbins, had recognized the Messiah of God in a Jewish adventurer named Coziba, who took the name of Bar-Cochab, The Son of the Star. He claimed to be the star prophesied by Balaam. The pretentions of Bar-Cochab were admitted, first by Akiba, and then by the other Jewish rabbins, and the people at large followed the lead of the elders, and all Israel went after The Son of the Star. Another terrible war followed. More than a million Jews lost their lives or their liberty. The whole country of

*Milman, History of the Jews, vol. 2, p. 380. Murray, 1866.

Galilee and Judea was so wasted that it has not recovered to this day. What was left of Jerusalem was razed to the ground. By order of the Emperor, Hadrian, the plow was passed over the site of the city, and it was sown with salt, and a new city, dedicated to Jupiter, was built on an adjoining hill. From that day to this the Jews have been a people without a country; wandering as strangers and pilgrims from land to land. Since the failure of Bar-Cochab no one claiming to be Messiah has risen up in Israel.

This brief account of the messiahship of Coziba is of value to us in these lectures because it enables us to compare his messiahship with the messiahship of Jesus. In these two histories, the history of Jesus and the history of Bar-Cochab, the contrast is perfect. Two human characters embodying two distinct conceptions of human government stand over against each other in the white light of history, —the one painted in the dark hues of the despair, the other in the glowing colors of hope; the one the cause of measureless misery, the other of infinite happiness; the one an awful failure, the other a marvelous success. I think I am safe in saying that the greater number of those who hear these words have never even heard the name of Coziba, called Bar-

Cochab. That name is known only to careful students of history. Bar-Cochab shot like a falling star through the sky of the Jewish-Roman world, followed by a trail of baleful light, and then went out into utter darkness, and his name has long since perished from the memory of man.

But who has not heard the name of Jesus. To-day* men and women the world over are celebrating his birthday, children are singing, bells are ringing, lights are burning,—all for joy because Jesus was born. Everywhere men are asking, What did Jesus do? What did Jesus say? What did Jesus mean?—and they profess to order their lives, in thought and word and deed, in obedience to the word of Jesus, and in submission to His will. There is no conqueror in history who can compare with Jesus in the extent and duration of His conquest. He has made the little hill tribe of Judah the master people of the world; because of Jesus the folklore of the Hebrew has become the sacred history of the western world, and the heroes of Israel, the heroes of mankind. Jesus to-day has the leadership of man, and human evolution must follow the lines laid down by the life of the Man of Nazareth.

*Lecture delivered Christmas night.

Now, if we look for the reason of the awful failure of Bar-Cochab, and the marvelous success of Jesus, we will not find that reason in what is called the supernatural. Jesus did not succeed because he was born of a virgin, or because He was reported to have risen bodily from the dead. These legends concerning Him are the result, not the cause, of the marvelous success of the man. These stories were told of Him only because the simple folk could in no other way adequately express their conception of the greatness of Jesus. Only a virgin born could be as pure as Jesus. Only a Son of God could be as great as Jesus. Only a life more powerful than death could have the strength of Jesus. The creeds of Christendom are of value, not as historical statements, for the primitive and mediæval Christian had no historical sense, but they are of immense value as attempts on the part of ordinary men to measure the greatest personality ever born into the world. If we look for the secret of the success of Jesus and of the failure of Bar-Cochab, we shall find that Bar-Cochab was ignorant of the law that governs all real conquests in human history, and that Jesus of Nazareth was the first great moralist

to discover that law, to give it formal expression, and to apply it to human life.

Count Leon Tolstoy* tells us that he was once reading the teachings of Jesus to a wise man from the east. The eastern sage, as he heard them, claimed one after another of the sayings of Jesus as original among his own people. But at last there was a saying of Jesus which the eastern did not claim, and which he admitted to be original with the Prophet of Nazareth. This original contribution of the Prophet of Nazareth to the moral wisdom of the world the eastern sage found in the words, "Resist not evil."

This wise man displayed all the acumen of his race when he fixed on these words as the words *per se* of Jesus of Nazareth, for they are the key to his gospel and to the secret of his success in the world.

Jesus enunciated this great moral discovery in the earlier and calmer years of his ministry. It was one of those truths of God which he saw with that clearness of vision which makes his words to be, not so much mere human wisdom, as divine revelation. This saying is the very keystone in the arch of that

*Quoted from memory.

new law which Jesus proclaimed, and by which he annulled the old law of Moses, the Jewish lawgiver. He cried: "Ye have heard that it hath been said an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth; but I say unto you resist not him that is evil; but whosoever will smite thee on the right cheek turn to him the other also."*

Now, no words of Jesus have been such a stumbling block to modern Christians as these words; they cannot believe that Jesus meant just what he said. They reckon this among the hyperbole of the Master; as if by this exaggeration He would call attention to the necessity of moderation in the use of physical force. We are not to resent all injuries, but only such injuries as seem to us excessive and to call for retaliation. But the words of Jesus will not bear this explanation. They mean what they say, or they mean nothing; and, if they mean nothing, then the Man who uttered them is guilty of solemnly affirming foolish and dangerous nonsense; and such a man has no right to the admiration and leadership of men. To call Him Lord! Lord! and at the same time to despise the things that He

*St. Matthew, v.: 38.

says, is to be guilty of folly far more foolish than the saying we deride.

This law is not, as some may suppose, the law of passive obedience, bidding us yield a ready submission to evil in the world. It is not a cowardly surrender to unrighteousness, a fearful cringing to wickedness in high places. It is not the teaching of a craven, who sells his soul for his safety. If such were the meaning of the words of Jesus we might well reject them as immoral and destructive of the highest interests of mankind. The doctrine of Jesus is not the doctrine of passive obedience; it is the doctrine of passive resistance. And it is this doctrine of passive resistance that is the great original doctrine that Jesus has contributed to moral science. We can best see the meaning of this saying if we interpret it by the life of Jesus Himself. Surely no one can accuse Jesus of timidity. He was not afraid to arraign the chief priests and rulers of His people at the bar of divine justice; in His short life He made more enemies than most men dare make in a long lifetime. And these enemies were bitter in their hatred,—so bitter that nothing but the destruction of Jesus would satisfy them. And Jesus knew the danger of His course of action.

He was not as a child playing with matches in a powder magazine, ignorant of his peril. He knew that He could escape only by submission, and He would not submit for one single instant. His whole life was not a life of obedience, but of rebellion against existing conditions and established authorities.

Jesus was in opposition from the beginning to the end of His days. And it is with His method of warfare that this saying, "Resist not evil," has to do—do not resist evil with evil. Do not resist physical force with physical force. Do not meet calumny with calumny, nor vituperation with vituperation. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good, meet calumny with silence and vituperation with kind words. Jesus would carry no sword or spear; He wore no helmet, nor breastplate; there were no greaves of brass upon His legs; but, for all that, Jesus was armed and protected. He was armed with the only weapons that are effectual for the settlement of disputes among men. He used the only method of warfare by which real conquests can be made. Jesus was wise enough to see that physical force can only decide physical questions. He knew as well as Bonaparte that God is always

on the side of the strongest battalions and the more skilful commander. A battle never decides any other matter except the relative strength and handling of the different armies. No moral issue is or can be settled by an appeal to the god of battles, for the god of battles knows no more of morality than the wind at sea or the ice blast on the mountain, which drowns and freezes indifferently the saint and the sinner. The questions which physical resistance could decide were not of interest to Jesus. He was not anxious to find out whether the Jew was a better fighter than the Roman, but only if he was a better man. And the method of Jesus was to pit the manhood of the Jew against the brutality of the Roman. He, the Jew, stood up alone against the whole Roman power, and dared it to do its worst, and it did its worst; but it could not hurt Jesus. He was stronger than Cæsar. Cæsar could kill the body of Jesus, but after that there was nothing more that Cæsar could do; but when the Roman had killed Him, then Jesus could and did undermine the Empire, change institutions, and alter the courses of history. The disbelief of the ordinary man in the saying of Jesus arises from his disbelief in the moral and spiritual life. If a man believes that aft-

er he is dead he can do nothing, why, of course, he will look upon death as the greatest calamity, and will seek to defend his physical life with all the forces at his command. But if a man be convinced that his real life lies in his soul, that physical death is simply an incident, and that by physical death he may acquire the greater influence and more extensive power,—then physical death will be chosen as the way to victory. Jesus based His doctrine of resist not evil upon the further doctrine that evil is limited in its power and operation. It can do so much and no more. And the surest, and, indeed, the only, way to defeat evil is to let it alone; it will rage and spend itself, and then it will be over and done with. Jesus's method of warfare is to fight evil, not by active resistance, but by passive endurance. He was ready, not to kill, but, if need were, to be killed. And the Christian world has, in doctrine, admitted the wisdom of the method of Jesus by finding in His death the salvation of mankind. It is true that the theologians have obscured the meaning of the death of Jesus by asserting that He died to satisfy the justice—that is, the vengeance—of God; but this whole idea of taking vengeance is utterly foreign to the teaching of the Master. To

visit evil with evil is the one thing that He says should never be done either by gods or men. His death did not satisfy the vengeance of God, for there was no god of vengeance to be satisfied. But His death did shame the wickedness of man. It showed the brute in all his brutality, the hypocrite in all his hypocrisy, the traitor in his treachery, and the coward in his cowardice. The death of Jesus was a manifestation of the power of the human soul, pure and simple, to withstand all the forces that can be brought against it. A man's soul is his impregnable fortress. Let him contain himself in that, and he is secure against all adversaries.

Jesus's method of passive resistance is by far the most economical of life and treasure of any mode of warfare that man can adopt. We have seen how the active resistance of the Jews to the Roman power lead to the death of millions and to the misery of millions more. While the Jews were resisting actively, the Christians were resisting passively. The wickedness of the Roman power was far more hateful to the Christian than to the Jew. The Christian would not recognize the validity of that power by so much as casting a grain of incense upon an altar. But the Christian did not wish to kill the

Roman; he wished to convert him; and so he manifested his hostility to the Roman system, not by fighting the Roman, but by preaching to the Roman that his system was evil, and, if he wished to escape from that evil, he must turn from the worship of Cæsar to the worship of Christ. And when the Roman was angry with him the Christian suffered the full consequence of that anger, and in so suffering revealed to the Roman a moral greatness which turned the anger of the Roman into admiration, love, and worship. And the loss of life in this warfare of the Christian against the Roman was as nothing when compared with the loss of the Jews. More Jewish lives were lost in the one year of Coziba's insurrection, than Christian lives were lost in the three centuries of Christian persecution. And there was this radical difference,—every Jew who died in arms made an enemy for the Jews. Every Christian who died unarmed made a friend for the Christians. So that it became a saying that the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church. The history of Jesus and the history of the establishment of Christianity give experimental proof of the soundness of His doctrine.

The method of Jesus is not only economical, but

it is effective. If you wish to subdue a man to your will so that he may be your slave, you cannot do it by killing him, for a dead man is no man's servant. You cannot do it by chaining him, for a man in chains has all he can do to carry his shackles. The only way to subdue a man is to win him. If you want him for your very own you must conquer something beside his hands and his feet; you must storm the citadel of his heart, and, instead of making him fear to disobey, you must make him love to obey. Now you can never make a dog love you by beating him; still less a man. In all God's universe it is the law that like begets like,—hate breeds hatred, and loving wins love. And Jesus, in the sublimity of His spiritual genius, gave expression by word and life to these very simple axiomatic principles, and by so doing put the world in the way of salvation.

As long as men hate one another and kill one another, so long will this world be a hell, and those who live in it, will not live at all, but all their days will be misery and death.

I do not think anyone can look at the present condition of so-called Christendom without a feeling of pity for the foolishness of man and of com-

passion for what must be the shame of Jesus at the conduct of His so-called followers. Here is all Christendom one vast armed camp, spending millions of lives and wasting billions of treasure getting ready to resist evil. And lo and behold all this vast waste of life and treasure is spent to oppose a phantom. The only evil which the nations have to resist is the evil which these armaments themselves create. If the nations were disarmed the nations would have nothing to fear. If any country in the world to-day were to disarm, and to announce to the world that it did so in the cause of peace that, respecting the rights of others, it would fear injury from none, what do you suppose would happen to that country. Its instant destruction by its more warlike neighbors? Not at all. That nation, especially if it were a strong nation, would instantly attract to itself the whole peace sentiment of the world. It would be like the monastery in the middle ages; it would gather into itself the moral force of mankind, and, like the monastery, it would in the end rule the world. For the monastery as well as the primitive church interpreted the words of Jesus literally. After the fall of the western empire in the fifth century Europe was overrun by

Barbarians from the north, whose two occupations were drinking and fighting. Every tribe was at war with its neighbor; every man's hand was against every man. In those days men lived in castles and wore chain armor. But in the midst of this universal warfare there were certain men who did not resist evil. They built their homes in the forest. Their gates were open day and night to welcome the stranger. If their enemy hungered, they fed him. If he thirsted, they gave him drink. If they were killed, they died praying for their murderers. They were sheep in the midst of wolves, and their destruction seemed inevitable. But what happened? Why, the monastery became the center of order; the nursery of civilization in Europe. Out of the monastery came the rulers of Europe. Hildebrand, the monk, was more powerful than Henry, the war lord. All the great warriors of the middle age were the servants of the monks. Charlemagne received his Empire from the monastic church. Frederick Barborossa humbled himself at the feet of the monks, and Henry IV. of Germany stood three days, barefooted in the snow, humbly suing for the pardon of a monk. If there were no other instance in history, the monastery would settle forever the ques-

tion as to the relative potency of physical and moral force. The moral is always the greater.

The ancient law of an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, is still in a large measure the law of human life as interpreted by the state. A man steals a loaf of bread to satisfy his hunger, and the state steals his liberty to satisfy its vengeance. A man kills another man in the heat of passion, or under great temptation, and the state kills him in cold blood, and without any temptation at all. And it is commonly believed that the doctrine, "Resist not evil," if applied to social life, would throw society back into anarchy. And yet criminology teaches us that severity toward criminals simply increases crime. In the good old times when robbers were broken on the wheel, and thieves were burned at the stake, robbers thronged every forest and beset every highway, while thieves and cut-throats lurked in every lane and alley of the city. As severity toward crime has lessened, the number of criminals and crimes has decreased. If we wish to put an end to crime we must in some way put an end to criminals. But you do not put an end to criminals by putting them in prison or by killing them. If you put a criminal in prison, you make him more of

a criminal than ever. Prisons are schools of crime, from which men graduate after a longer or shorter period of education to prey upon society. Nor do you put an end to a criminal by killing him. A dead criminal is still a criminal. When the state solemnly executes a man it gives eternal significance to his crime. It can never be changed, but must remain forever a blot on human history. The vengeance of the state falls on innocent and guilty alike. The father and the mother, the wife and the children, must bear the shame of the crime forever. The only way to put an end to a criminal is to make him an honest man. You must in some way reach his soul, and stir within that soul the desire to do good. And, if you would have a man do good you must be good to him; you must reach his soul as Dinah Morris reached the poor soul of Hetty Sorel, the child murderer,—reached it not by accusation and severity, but by laying her cheek against the cheek of the hardened sinner until at last the love of Dinah thawed the heart of Hetty. So that heart wept tears of penitence; and Hetty was no longer a criminal, but a sorrowful, heart-broken woman. Victor Hugo was not a mere romancer; he was a pro-

found psychologist; when he told the story of the good bishop and Jean Val Jean. Resist not evil, is the maxim of the good bishop. Jean Val Jean, the convict from the galleys, abuses the holy man's hospitality by stealing his silver spoons. He is arrested and brought back to the Episcopal residence. The bishop lies and says to the officer that he had given the spoons to the man, and upbraids Jean Val Jean because he had forgotten to take the silver candle sticks as well. Does this act of the bishop make Jean Val Jean more or less a criminal. You know the story. From that instant the soul of Jean Val Jean was transformed. He became so great that the injustice of society could not crush him. The victim of that injustice, he triumphed over it by the greatness of his soul.

If society were to practice the doctrine of Jesus, of St. Francis of Assisi, and of Victor Hugo, we should soon have no need for our jails and our gallows. If we were always ready to forgive the sinner, we should have no need for further punishment—but forgiveness would bring him to penitence, and penitence to reformation.*

*Asylums, not prisons, will mark the next stage in criminal jurisprudence.

To practice the precept of Jesus is not easy, because it requires the love of Jesus for men, and the patience of Jesus with men. Jesus's love for men was so great that it consumed at once any feeling of resentment against them. He pitied and prayed for His murderers in the moment of His own agony and death. Jesus's patience with men was so unlimited that He was willing to wait for ages if only so He could win the heart of man to His way of thinking and feeling. Coziba, called Bar-Cochab, would overthrow the Roman power in a day; Jesus worked three hundred years to accomplish the same result. Coziba would conquer Rome by force of arms; Jesus by force of love. Coziba would destroy; Jesus would assimilate. Coziba's work was done when Coziba died; Jesus's real work did not begin until the day after His death. Coziba and his tribe are men of the past; Jesus is the man of the future. Let those of us who still believe in Jesus take heart. Evolution is on our side. Slowly, but surely, the world is coming round to Jesus's way of thinking. Formerly men gloried in warfare; now they apologize for it. In old time men went out to kill and to spoil their enemies; now they go with battleship and army to civilize them. If we kill the

Filipino or the Boer, we do it only for their good. And we are more or less ashamed of ourselves, because we can find no better way to elevate them than the way of violence and treachery. We are ashamed of our slums, of our jails and our gibbets; and with shame will come sorrow, and with sorrow a better mind; and by and by we shall agree with Jesus that the only way to conquer our enemy is to make him our friend; the only way to overcome evil is to overcome evil with good. When that day comes, as it surely will, then we shall hear again the angels singing, "Peace on earth; good will toward men."

And, if we choose, that day can come to us to-night. To-night we can be Jesus men; men who will suffer evil, but never do it.

The Imperialized Church.

On the 27th of October in the year 312 of the Christian era Constantine, son of Constantius Chlorus, was on the eve of a battle that was to decide the destinies of the Roman Empire. His enemy was Maxentius, a rival for the imperial power, who held the Malvian bridge and barred the way of Constantine to Rome. Maxentius was a believer in the ancient Roman religion, and was using all the means prescribed by the ancient ritual to win the favor of the gods, and to secure their aid in the coming battle. Constantine, knowing that his enemy was thus engaged, was greatly disturbed in his mind. He knew that his fate and the fate of the Roman world was to be decided on the morrow, "and, being convinced," says the historian Eusebius, "that he needed some more powerful aid than his military forces could afford him, on account of the wicked and magical enchantments which were so diligently practiced by the tyrant, Maxentius, he began to seek for divine assistance, and while he was thus

praying with fervent entreaty a most marvelous sign appeared to him from heaven, the account of which it may have been difficult to receive with credit had it been related by any other person; but, since the victorious Emperor himself long afterward declared it to the writer of this history, when he was honored with his acquaintance and society, and confirmed it with an oath, who could hesitate to credit the relation, especially since the testimony of after times has established its truth. He said that at midday, when the sun was beginning to decline, he saw, with his own eyes, the trophy of a cross of light in the heavens above the sun, and bearing the inscription, 'By this conquer.'

At this sight he himself was struck with amazement, and his whole army also, which happened to be following him on some expedition, and witnessed the miracle. He said, moreover, that he doubted within himself what the import of this apparition could be; and while he continued to ponder and to reason on its meaning, night imperceptibly drew on, and in his sleep the Christ of God appeared to him with the same sign which he had seen in the heavens, and commanded him to procure a standard

made in the likeness of that sign, and to use it as a safeguard in all engagements against his enemies."

Thus in courtly phrase does the historian Eusebius tell us of one of the most important events in the history of the world. With the conversion of Constantine the revolution was consummated by which the ancient Greek and Roman world was carried from the worship of the gods of nature, to the worship of God in Christ. That Constantine thought he saw the sign of the cross in the sky is certain. And it is also a matter of fact that he was obedient to his supposed heavenly vision. He made a standard on which he placed the sign of the cross, and, following this standard, he not only defeated Maxentius at the battle of Malvian bridge, but by an uninterrupted course of good fortune he made himself master of the Roman world and reunited the Empire in his own person. Immediately after the battle of Malvian bridge Constantine and his then eastern colleague, Licinius, issued the famous Edict of Milan,* granting liberty to all Romans to worship, acording to the dictates of their reason and conscience. This Edict was made in favor of the Christians, and its effect was to make Christianity

*Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, bk. 10, chap. v.

the religion of the Empire. Twelve years after the Edict of Milan Constantine, then sole Emperor of the Roman world, presided at the opening of a great council of Christian bishops and doctors held in the city of Nicæa, and at the death of Constantine, in 337, the Christian religion was firmly established as the state religion of the Roman world. Then it was that the adherents of the ancient religions were called pagans, from the word "pagus" which means country; for only rude rustics believed any longer in the gods of the hills and the groves.

But this triumph of Christianity was not an unqualified victory for the religion of Jesus. If Jesus did, indeed, inspire Constantine with the hope of success on the eve of his battle with Maxentius, then Jesus in heaven must have utterly forgotten the teaching of Jesus on earth. He who said, "Resist not evil," could hardly be the same as the one who said, make of my cross a standard, and by means of its magic power go out and conquer your enemies. The moral distance between the saying of Jesus and the vision of Constantine is the distance that organized Christianity had traveled from the

death of Jesus on the cross to the conversion of the Roman Emperor by the cross. In those three hundred years the imperial state had been profoundly influenced by the democratic church, and the church in turn had been influenced and modified by the imperial state.

In the second century, immediately after the fall of Nero, the moral reaction, of which the Christian church was the embodiment, made itself felt in every section of Roman society, and in every department of Roman life. The state still looked upon the Christian faith as a deadly superstition, hostile to the life of the Empire. Yet the state itself was stirred to its depths by that doctrine of righteousness which was preached by Christian apostles in the lanes and byways of every city in the Empire.

The fear of God and the enthusiasm for humanity which were generated in the church kindled a fire that spread far and wide throughout the Roman Empire. Everywhere men began to bethink themselves, and to amend their lives. Emperors began to use their power, not to glut their own lust and cruelty, but to promote the wellbeing of the people. After a short period of disorder the death of

Nero was followed by the accession of Vespasian, a rude soldier, but a just man, who ruled the Empire with wisdom and moderation for the space of nine years, and was succeeded at his death, in the year 79, by his son, Titus, the conqueror of Jerusalem, a man greatly beloved by the army and the people. Titus reigned only twenty-six months, when he was carried off by a fever that was then devastating the world. In the person of his brother, Domitian, the Roman world fell once more into the hands of a madman and a tyrant. For fifteen years Rome repeated, in the reign of Domitian, son of Vespasian, the cruelty and licentiousness of the reign of Nero. Gloomy, superstitious, and cruel, this Emperor sacrificed the leading members of the Senate to his own fears, and terror ruled in Rome until the death of Domitian, who was murdered by his attendants in the year 96.

The death of Domitian was followed by one of the happiest periods, not only in the history of the Roman Empire, but also in the history of the world. "If," says the historian Gibbon, "a man were called to fix the period in the history of the world during which the condition of the human race was most

happy and prosperous, he would without hesitation name that which elapsed from the death of Domitian to the accession of Commodus. The vast extent of the Roman Empire was governed by absolute power under the guidance of virtue and wisdom. The armies were restrained by the firm, but gentle, hand of four successive Emperors, whose characters and authority commanded involuntary respect."* The Emperors to whom the historian refers in this passage are Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius. On the death of Domitian, Marcus Cocceius Nerva was proclaimed Emperor by the Pretorian Guards and confirmed by the Senate. The new Emperor was an aged senator of blameless life, but too feeble to bear the cares of Empire. Of this no one was more conscious than Nerva himself. With the approbation of the Senate and people the Emperor adopted as his son and successor Trajan, a Spaniard distinguished as a general and a statesman. Trajan shared the imperial power with his father during the lifetime of Nerva, and at his

*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, E. Gibbon, chaps. III., IV.

death became the master of the world. Trajan was renowned no less for administrative ability in civil affairs, than he was for martial ambition and military success. He was the last of the Romans to extend the boundaries of the Empire. He added Dacia, beyond the Danube, and Arabia Petra to the imperial domain, and penetrated with his armies beyond the Euphrates and the Tigris. He died at Selinus, in Cilicia, as he was returning in triumph to Rome, in the year 117, after a glorious reign of nineteen years. The relation of Trajan to the Christian religion was that of a wise and good man who was troubled by the presence in his Empire of a people who stubbornly refused to conform to ancient customs or to recognize the divine authority of the government. Trajan used every effort to find out what the new religion really was and the secret of its power over the people. He instructed his friend, Pliny the Younger, governor of Bithynia, to examine the Christians by torture, and to ascertain, if he could, the doctrines which they taught and the nature of their secret rites. On the evidence thus obtained, the Roman philosopher "could detect nothing further than a culpable and extravagant superstition. The only facts he could discover were, that

they had a custom of meeting together before daylight and singing a hymn to Christ as God. They were bound together by no unlawful sacraments, but only under mutual obligation not to commit theft, robbery, adultery, or fraud. They met a second time in the day, and partook together of food, but that of a perfectly innocent kind. The test of guilt to which he submitted the most obstinate delinquents was adoration before the statues of the gods and of the Emperor and the malediction of Christ. Those who refused he ordered led to execution." Under the circumstances, Trajan could do nothing but sentence the Christians to death for treason against the state. In denying the divinity of the Empire, they denied the Empire itself. If the authority, the Empire, were not divine, it was brutal. If it had not the sanction of the gods, its only sanction was the brute strength of the soldier.

In studying the relation of church and state during the anti-Christian period we must always remember that we are reading the history of a religious conflict. The city of Rome, as we have already learned, was intensely religious. Its foundations were laid in the fear of the gods. To the gods

it looked for favor, for protection, and for victory; and its calamities it ascribed to the anger of the gods. The Christians were guilty of the crime of dishonoring and denying the gods. In the estimation of their generations they were atheists, and as such deserved no better fate than to be thrown to the lions and burned at the stake. It was the wise and good Emperor Trajan who sent the holy bishop Ignatius from Antioch to be cast to the wild beasts in the amphitheater at Rome.

Trajan was succeeded in the Empire by his cousin, Hadrian, who, lacking the military genius and ambition of his predecessor, withdrew the legions from beyond the Tigris, abandoned the conquests of Trajan, and gave to the Empire the blessing of peace. Hadrian was restless by nature, and spent his time in journeying from place to place, investigating the administration of the Empire, and punishing those who were guilty of corruption in office, and so delivering the people from oppressive rule. Hadrian, following the example of Nerva, adopted as his son and successor the best and wisest of the living Romans, the senator Titus Antoninus, called Antoninus Pius, on condition that he would in turn adopt Marcus Annius Verus, afterward called Marcus Aurelius.

The joint reigns of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius, covering a period of forty-seven years, are without doubt the twilight hours of the ancient world. In these two Emperors Roman virtue manifested itself in all the beauty and pathos of a sunset glow. Antoninus, the sage, and Marcus Aurelius, the saint, were men who would have done honor to any religion. They ruled in righteousness, and had hearts to pity the miseries of the people. Marcus Aurelius is recognized by men of all creeds as one of the great spiritual leaders of mankind. He lived a life of austere virtue without hope of other reward than the approval of his own conscience. He was a saint in a palace, a humble soul with the world at his feet. That he should have missed the secret of Jesus was his misfortune, and not his fault. He was the last of the ancients; the victim of a dying world. With the death of Marcus on the 17th of March in the year 180, the sun of Roman greatness went down into a night of gloom. Commodus, the son of Marcus, was a tyrant of the worst type, vieing with Nero and Domitian for the palm of infamy among the rulers of the world. From Commodus, who was murdered in 190, to the accession of Diocletian in 284, twenty-three Emperors rose and fell.

Thirteen of these were slain by their own servants or soldiers. Only three, Severus, Aurelian, and Probus, have left names worthy of remembrance. Diocletian, a Dalmatian peasant, made one last effort to destroy Christianity, revive the ancient faith, and to re-establish the authority of the empire. He swept away the last vestige of the ancient Roman liberties, and made the government an oriental despotism, pure and simple. His scheme of dividing the Empire into four grand divisions under two Emperors and two Cæsars was a failure from the first, and, wearied in his effort to hold together the falling state, Diocletian resigned the Empire in the fifty-ninth year of his age and turned his attention to raising cabbages. The retirement of Diocletian was followed by a period of confusion until Constantine re-established the imperial power in his own person, and reconstituted the Empire on a Christian basis. Whether Constantine was converted by miracle or by reason, his course was dictated by far-seeing wisdom and consummate statesmanship. In the Christian religion he found the only remaining

faith by which men could live and in the Christian churches the only centers of order in the Empire.

For three-hundred years the churches had been increasing their numbers and perfecting their organization. They had gathered into their membership nearly all the moral worth of the Empire. Men who wished to live clean, sober, industrious lives turned to the Christian church as to a place of safety; for it was the first principle of the church that men should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world. The church attracted to its fold by the powerful magnet of holiness. We wonder what brought men into the Christian church and what kept them there. The whole world was against them. Christianity was not fashionable in those days. To become a Christian meant to become an outcast. The very name was an accusation. If a man entered the church he did it at the hazard of his life; he severed the noblest ties of humanity; he became an object of hatred to his own father and mother; his wife and his children looked on him with horror. Yet, for all this, men and women crowded into the church by the thousand, and there they stayed in spite of entreaty, of perse-

cution, and death. Now the power that brought men to the church and kept them there was the power of holiness. It was the longing to be clean that caused men to come and be washed in the waters of baptism.

Men were drawn to the Christian church, not only by this power of holiness, but also by the sense of brotherhood. Christianity defined religion in terms of social service as well as in terms of personal purity. "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this: To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world."* The sense of brotherhood gave to the Christian church that unity which is strength. While all the outside world was groaning under a system of class and cast, the Christian church was inspired by the spirit of equality, which made of every man a person, with the force of a personality to do and to dare for Christ and the church. That is a great age in any community, when every man counts for one, stands for what he is, and contributes what he has to the common cause.

The primitive Christian churches were not simply

*James 1.: 27.

congregations; they were communities having a common faith and sharing in a common life. While we cannot say that community of goods was the practice of the primitive church for any length of time, yet we can say that community of life was the characteristic of the first age of Christianity. Every Christian had the right to share in the average prosperity of the Christian world. Vast wealth and abject poverty could not dwell side by side under the shadow of the cross. The wealth was unhappy until it had emptied itself to supply the wants of the needy. Thus there was, by the end of the third century, in every town of the Roman Empire a Christian church bound together by a common belief, inspired by a common hope, and living a common life.

Each of these societies was under the presidency* of a bishop chosen by itself, and was advised by a council of elders taken directly from the people. At first there was no distinction between the clergy and the laity, the minister was simply a layman in office, no more sacred than the poorest and most obscure member of the society. According to Apostolic teaching every follower of Christ was a priest

*Justin Martyr, 1st Apology, chap. LXV.

and a king. The rise of the Episcopal order to power was the natural result of the life led by the bishop. While the church was in opposition and subject to persecution the bishop was naturally the first to suffer. He, as the leader of his people, had to bear the blame for them all. His conspicuous position was the post of danger. He stood every day between his people and death. Such a discipline could produce nothing but moral heroes, and such of necessity were the bishops of the anti-Nicæan church,—men who hazarded their lives daily for the sake of the people under their charge. And their office compelled them to lives of benevolence. They were at the beck and call of the poor; they were the servants of slaves and beggars. Christian history is full of beautiful stories of Episcopal humility and Episcopal benevolence. We have just been telling our children of Santa Claus, the giver of gifts, the friend of children. But who of us know that Santa Claus is not the jolly Dutch saint of the nursery, but a gentle bishop, Saint Nicholas of Mysia, who used to steal about his city and find out secretly the needs of his people and then supply that need by putting money in the window and hiding it in chimney corners. It was men like

Nicholas and Polycarp and a host of others who won for the Episcopate its place and power in the world. And it was this government of love that grew stronger and stronger while the government of force grew weaker and weaker, until at last the government by force found its only safety in allying itself to the government by love.

The triumph of Christianity in the fourth century was the triumph of moral over physical force, and, though that triumph was partial, it was still a victory for all time and for all the world.

It is true that when Constantine established the Christian religion as the religion of the Empire the church had lost much of its primitive simplicity and purity. Its membership contained vast numbers who were Christians, not so much from choice, as from inheritance. These were lacking in that zeal which belongs only to the convert; to the man who, after struggle and sacrifice, finds God for himself. In spite of persecutions the greater number of the Christians lived at ease. They found safety in their numbers. And the virtues of the Christians were conducive to their temporal wellbeing. Sobriety and industry, honesty and frugality, produced their natural result, and the Christians became pros-

perous and wealthy, and with prosperity and wealth came spiritual coldness and a love of this present world. The office of bishop, while it was a place of danger, was also the post of honor; and men aspired to the Episcopate more for the sake of the honor than for the desire for sacrifice. In spite of the teaching of Jesus, office seeking crept into the church and corrupted its simplicity.

A still more deadly evil was the spirit of theological contention, which at this time took possession of the church and changed the religion of Christ into a religion of hatred instead of a religion of love. The fierce contentions which had destroyed the unity of Christians could not but weaken the moral stamina of the community. It was the loss of simplicity by reason of theological subtilty followed by theological fury that was the secret of the church's failure in the fourth century to make the kingdoms of this world the kingdoms of God and His Christ. The church surrendered to the Emperor as truly as the Emperor submitted to the church. The concordat between Constantine and the bishops was the first of those agreements, since so common, to sacrifice the essence of Christianity to the safety of its form, and to make the worship of the person of Christ a substitute for the practice of His teaching.

Constantine was a man of violent and gloomy temper. He put to death his sister's husband, his own eldest son, and his wife; and yet this was the man whom the bishops of the church fawned upon and chose as the champion of the church of Christ. But in spite of the character of Constantine and the degeneracy of the church, the establishment of Christianity was a forward movement in the history of the race. It was not so much the establishment of the church as it was the recognition of the new ideal. Men were no longer compelled to worship Cæsar as divine. He was nothing but a mortal man, God's servant, and subject to the judgment of Christ. Christ crucified was and is a standing reproach to a luxurious and self-seeking world. Vast and important changes in the social state of the Empire followed hard upon the conversion of the Emperor and the peace of the church. Gladiatorial shows, the disgrace of the ancient world, disappeared. The condition of the slave was ameliorated, and slavery was discredited and put in the way of abolition. The desire for personal purity and the passion for social service were honored, not only by the church,

but by the world. The Christian type of character became the accepted type; and the Christian type was a distinct advance on that which it supplanted. And in the struggle for Christian perfection the world was saved from the corrupting ideals that were fostered by the ancient religions.

But, if the Empire became in a measure Christianized, the church to an equal degree became imperialized. The Episcopate was no longer the post of danger; it was a position of dignity and honor. The Christian ministry succeeded to the privileges of the ancient priesthoods. The temples of Jupiter, Mars, and Venus became Christian churches, and the Bishop of Rome assumed the title of Pontifix Maximus.

The Subjection of the Eastern Church to the State.

On Good Friday, in the year 404, the church of Saint Sophia, in Constantinople, was a scene of wild confusion. The soldiers of the Emperor invaded the sanctuary, disturbed the sacrament of baptism, silenced the voice of the minister, stained the baptismal waters and the floor of the sanctuary with the blood of the worshipers; the sacred vessels were snatched from the altar, and the sacred elements of bread and wine were trodden under foot. It must not be supposed that the soldiers who were guilty of this sacrilege were heathen men, the willing instruments of heathen Emperors. On the contrary, they were nominally Christian soldiers, obeying the orders of a nominally Christian Emperor. The cause of the disturbance was the anger which had been roused in the imperial palace by the preaching of the Bishop of Constantinople. The bishop against whom this violence was directed is known

to history as Saint Chrysostom. The instigator of the violence was Eudoxia, wife of the Emperor Arcadius.

Only sixty-seven years had passed away since the death of Constantine, but in that brief period of time the whole character of the Roman world had been transformed. Constantine had removed the capital of the Empire from the city of Rome, on the Tiber, to the site of the town Byzantium, on the Bosphorus. The Emperor had seen at a glance the vast strategic importance of this site, commanding as it does, the water way from the East to the West, so he seized upon it and made it the seat of his Empire. Almost in a night he built a great city in place of the provincial town, and called it New Rome. The buildings of the new city were executed, says the historian Gibbon, by such artificers as the reign of Constantine could afford, but they were decorated by the hands of the most celebrated masters of the age of Pericles and Alexander. By the command of Constantine the cities of Greece and Asia were despoiled of their valuable ornaments, which were used to adorn this city of the Cæsar. The new city, says Mr. Finlay in his history of

Greece under the Romans, was an exact copy of old Rome. It was inhabited by senators from Rome. Wealthy individuals, likewise, from the provinces were compelled to keep up houses in Constantinople; pensions were conferred upon them, and a right to a certain amount of provision from the public stores was attached to their dwelling. Eighty thousand loaves of bread were distributed daily to the inhabitants of Constantinople. For, though Constantine called the city New Rome, he could not fix that name upon his new capital. The people saw instinctively that this city had no right to the name of Rome. It was in no sense the creation of the Roman people. It was the arbitrary creation of an oriental despot; it was the genius and power of Constantine that brought this city into existence, and it was naturally called Constantinopolis, or the city of Constantine, and so it is called even to this present day. A city so built and so constituted could have none of the characteristics of ancient Rome. It was a city without a history. No traditions of ancient liberty haunted its streets and squares, as such traditions haunted the Appian Way, the Via Sacra, the Circus Maximus, and the Forum of old Rome. The Senate, transplanted from its

time-honored seat on the Capitoline hill, lost every vestige of its sacredness and of its authority. It was simply a useless appendage to the imperial court. The world was ruled, not from the Senate house, but from the imperial palace. It was not the conscript fathers that decided the fate of the nations; it was the eunuchs and the women of the court. The rule of the Sultan in Constantinople to-day is not unlike that of the Christian Emperors from the building of the city by Constantine to its conquest by the Turks in 1453. When the city surrendered to Mahomet II. it did not change its form of government; it only changed its master. It was an oriental despotism before its fall, and it has been an oriental despotism ever since.

At the death of Constantine there was a redivision of the Empire, his three sons, Constantine, Constans, and Constantius, each taking a portion. But this division was of short duration. Constantine II. was killed in battle by the forces of his brother Constans, who in turn was murdered by his own soldiery; thus leaving Constantius sole ruler of the Empire. All of these Emperors were nominally

Christian. They took an active part in the affairs of the church. In the great conflict between the Arians and the orthodox bishops, the Emperors were sometimes on one side and sometimes on the other. Constantius banished Athanasius from Alexandria, and Constans gave the Alexandrian a triumphant welcome to Rome. Church and state were only different instrumentalities used by the Emperors to further their own ends. On the death of Constantius, his nephew, Julian, known as the Apostate, succeeded to the throne, and made one last effort to restore the ancient religion of the Empire. He surrounded himself with philosophers, banished the bishops from his court, and sacrificed at the altars of Jupiter and Apollo. But this attempt of the Emperor to revive the old faith ended in dismal failure. The people refused to follow him; they would not keep the festivals, nor bring offerings to the altars of the ancient gods. Julian himself had no real faith in the religion which he tried to restore. It was hatred of Christianity, rather than love of the ancient cult, which caused Julian to set up the one in opposition to the other. And we cannot wonder

that Julian felt bitterly toward the new religion. The Christianity of his day was not the religion of Jesus; it was the ecclesiasticism of Constantine and the bishops. The sons of Constantine, Christians though they were, had in true oriental fashion put to death the father of Julian and all his kindred, and had kept him in degrading inferiority. The young prince, in order to save his life, was obliged to practise the most consummate dissimulation. When the necessities of the Empire compelled Constantius to intrust Julian with the government of the west, the nephew was still followed by the jealous suspicion of the uncle, and was at last forced to raise the standard of revolt to insure his own safety. The death of Constantius left Julian in sole possession of the Empire, and he came to the throne embittered against existing conditions, and it was this bitterness that led him to revolt against the established religion. The doctrines of the church excited his derision, the divisions of the church caused him constant annoyance, and the ambition of the bishops and clergy roused his contempt; and he thought to get rid of the evils of his time by undoing the work of centuries and bringing back conditions that existed in the Roman world before the preaching of the

gospel of Christ. But such efforts to restore the past are always futile, and Julian died confessing that the Galilean had conquered. With his death the family of Constantine became extinct, and the Empire was once more the prize of the successful general. At the time of his death Julian was leading an expedition against the Persians. The army raised one of its leading commanders, Jovian, to the throne, who displaced a great number of brave generals and able functionaries whom Julian had appointed because of their zeal for paganism, and in their place put zealous Christians and restored Christianity as the established religion of the Empire. "From that period,"* says de Sismondi, "up to the fall of the Empire a hostile sect, which regarded itself as unjustly stripped of its ancient honors, invoked the vengeance of the gods on the heads of the government, exulted in the public calamities, and probably hastened them by its intrigues, though inextricably involved in the common ruin. The pagan faith, which was not attached to a body of doctrine, nor supported by a corporation of priests, nor heightened by the fervor of novelty, scarcely

*The Fall of the Roman Empire, J. C. L. de Sismondi, chap. v.

ever displayed itself in open revolt or dared the perils of martyrdom; but pagans still occupied the foremost rank in letters, the orators, the philosophers (or, as they were otherwise called, sophists), the historians, belonged almost without exception to the ancient religion. It still kept possession of the most illustrious schools, especially those of Athens and Alexandria; the majority of the Roman Senate were attached to it, and in the breasts of the common people, particularly the rural population, it maintained its power for several centuries, branded, however, with the name of Magic."

But the ancient faith did more than simply stand aside in sullen opposition. Vast numbers of pagans conformed to Christianity without understanding its principles, or believing in its way of life, and these new adherents transformed the faith of Christ into the likeness of the ancient religion of Greece and Rome. They paganized and imperialized the church of Jesus. It was impossible that the idealism of Jesus should not suffer when it came in contact with the gross realities of the world. The religion of Jesus demanded a purity of heart and a simplicity of life which are impossible of attainment by the mass of mankind. The best that the average man

can do is to make some approach to the truth as it is in Jesus. Only choice souls, those in whom the moral and spiritual nature is developed in an extraordinary degree, can live the life that Jesus prescribed as the highest life possible to man. As long as man is of the earth, earthy, he cannot so much as comprehend the character and teaching of the man who lives in and for the spiritual and the moral. It was inevitable that the teachings of Jesus should be misconstrued by His followers, and depraved by the world at large. As soon as the religion of Jesus left its native heath of upper Galilee it began to suffer from the admixture of foreign elements. Paul, fervent follower of Christ, though he was, could not help darkening his Christian teaching with the subtleties and obscurities of the rabbinical schools. The writer of the fourth Gospel, steeped as he was in the philosophy of Plato as interpreted by the Alexandrian Jew Philo Judæus, could not help translating the teaching of Jesus into the terms of that philosophy with which he was most familiar. And when the new religion was torn from its Jewish origin and became the property of the Greco-Roman world then the Greco-Roman world transformed that religion into its own likeness. The Greek made

of Christianity a philosophy; the Roman made of it an empire.

With the philosophy which the Greek dialectic, under the name of theology, substituted for the religion of Jesus we have nothing to do in these lectures, only so far as the contentions of the church were used by the Emperors as a means for subduing the church to the imperial will. Our present concern is with the relation of the church to the state. With the establishment of Christianity as the state religion, the Christian commonwealth ceased to exist. That life which the Christians had led apart from the world was no longer possible. When everybody is a Christian nobody is a Christian. That doctrine of the primitive church which taught the communion of saints lost its meaning and remained in the creed, not as an active element in the Christian's faith, but only as an historical deposit.

While, as we have learned in a previous lecture, community of goods was not a precept or a practice for any length of time of the early church, yet community of life was. The early church was a mutual benefit society, in the goods of which every

member's share was according to his need. The bishops of the church were the fathers of the people, having with the father's authority the father's responsibility;* with the care of the children as the uppermost thought in their minds, and the chief duty of their lives. With the establishment of Christianity all this was instantly changed. The gifts which the Emperors bestowed upon the clergy, the immunities which he granted them, soon directed the ambition of the average Christian entirely to ecclesiastical dignities. The bishop was changed at once from a hero to a sycophant. He was willing then, as he has, alas, been only too willing since, to condone every crime in the person of the ruler who was able to promote him to places of honor. For more than a century the spirit of Jesus struggled with the rising tide of corruption within the church. Christianity in the fourth and fifth centuries was not without its saints and martyrs. But these saints and martyrs were not the official leaders of the church, or, if leaders, were driven forth from their leadership and made to suffer persecution for the cause of true religion. With the death of Jovian, the Empire fell into the hands of Valentinian, a brave and

*Apostolic Constitutions, bk. 4, § 1.

worthy officer, who associated his brother Valens with himself in the cares of Empire, Valentinian reigning in the west, and Valens in the east. Valentinian established universal toleration by law and took no part in the sectarian controversies that divided Christendom. Valens was an Arian, and persecuted the Orthodox party. The Emperors, though they ceded the deity to God in Christ, still considered themselves as Pontifex Maximus, as the head both of the church and the state; and the fortunes of the various parties within the church rose and fell in accordance with the leaning of the Emperor toward one opinion or the other.

Gratian, the son of Valentinian, succeeded to the Empire of the west on the death of his father, and, finding himself unequal to the task of governing the distracted world, he chose with great magnanimity a man who was his enemy to share the throne. He adopted Theodosius a Spaniard, the son of a man whom he had sent to the scaffold, as his colleague, and placed him at the head of the armies. Theodosius was a devout Christian. He was baptized

during a serious illness by a Catholic bishop, and when he rose from his sick bed he issued his famous edict establishing the Orthodox or Catholic faith as the religion of the Empire. This edict reads as follows: "To the people of Constantinople—We desire that all nations who are governed by the rule of our clemency shall practise that religion which the Apostle Peter himself delivered to the Romans, and which it is manifest that the pontiff, Damasus, and Peter Bishop of Alexandria, a man of apostolic sanctity, do now follow, that, according to the discipline of the Apostles and the teaching of the Evangelists, they believe in the one Godhead of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in equal majesty, and the Holy Trinity. We order all who follow this law to assume the name of Catholic Christians, decreeing that all others, being mad and foolish persons, shall bear the infamy of their heretical dogmas, and that their conventicles shall not receive the name of churches; they to be punished first by Divine vengeance, and afterward by that exertion of our power to chastise which we have received from the decree of heaven."

As we read this Edict of Theodosius we won-

der what has become of the Spirit of Jesus. Can these be the words of a disciple of the Prophet of Nazareth, who said "Resist not evil," and who from the cross prayed for his persecutors, saying: "Father forgive them; they know not what they do?" With this Edict of Theodosius we come to the parting of the ways at which the religion of Jesus and the Christianity of the church separated one from the other, never to meet again in history. The church in the days of her domination forgot the Lord and His teaching, and followed the way of the world. From this hour we begin to read the disgraceful history of persecution, not of the church, but by the church. A new and fearful crime came into existence with the establishment of Christianity as the religion of the world. Men had been punished of old for murder, for adultery, for robbery, and for arson. It was not until the days of triumphant Christianity that the crime of heresy was known and visited with imprisonment and death. The Romans punished the Christians, not as heretics, but as rebels; but when Christianity was set up in the world men and women were condemned for misplacing an iota or misconstruing a passage of scripture. It was dangerous to think, and fatal to express an opinion. It is impossible to compute

the injury which has come to mankind by the enforcement of the principle laid down in the Edict of Theodosius. It arrested the progress of Christianity in the east. For more than a thousand years the eastern church has been held in the iron hand of an inexorable orthodoxy. The great body of Christians receiving their religion from without, a mere imposition of authority, have long since lost the power of motion, and are an inert mass used to sustain the despotism that holds them in subjection.

From the days of Theodosius the eastern church suffered a rapid and mortal decline. It was Eudoxia, the wife of Arcadius, the son of Theodosius, who drove St. John Chrysostom into exile, and, seeing the fate of this saint, no bishop dared thereafter to brave the wrath of the women and the eunuchs of the palace. Ecclesiastics became the most courtly of men, and bowed low in the antechambers of the mistresses and favorites of the reigning Emperor. The great bishops of the fifth century had no successors. It required men of baser mold than Basil and the Gregories to gain and hold the favor of the Eudoxias, Pulcherias, and Theodoras, and women of like character who, during the sixth and succeeding centuries, were the real rulers

of the eastern Empire. For it was then, as always, in every decadent civilization it is the decadent women that rule the world. It took three hundred years for the Christian religion to become the established religion of the Roman world, and it took just three hundred years for that religion, as established, to fall from its high place, to become, not a dominant, but a subject, religion,—a religion which is allowed to exist simply through the contemptuous toleration of its conquerers.

In the year 620, just three hundred years, less five, after the sitting of the Council of Nice, which fixed the creed of Christendom and made heresy a crime, Mahomet, the Arabian prophet, made his hegira from the city of Mecca to Medina. This hegira or flight of the prophet marks the beginning of the Moslem epoch. Within a few years of the death of the prophet Galilee and Judea, the original home of Christianity, together with Syria and the east, were forever lost to Christendom and to the Empire. Christianity, depraved by a corrupt priesthood, weakened by secession after secession of Nestorian, Eutychian, and other heretics, worn out by endless contentions, worshipping trinities,

angels, saints, and martyrs, had no power to withstand the enthusiasts who rushed, out of the Arabian desert with their stern, monotheistic creed. And for the next thousand years the history of the east is the history of the Moslem conquest. The Christian church, the subservient instrument of Christian imperialism, has become the equally subservient slave of Moslem despotism. To this day the patriarch of Constantinople holds his office subject to the will of the Sultan. Having taught passive obedience for so long, the eastern Christian has lost all knowledge of and power for passive resistance. He is the slave to the Sultan because he is also a slave to the church. His blind orthodoxy is largely to blame for his tame submission to outrage.

Before the fall of Constantinople the eastern church made one important conquest for Christianity. It was the eastern church that added Russia to the domain of Christendom. But the conversion of the Russians was not the work of an army of zealous missionaries hazarding their lives for the faith; it was the work of the Byzantine court. Vladimir, the ruler of the Russians, demanded the daughter of the Byzantine Emperor in marriage. His baptism was made a condition of granting his prayer.

Nothing loath, this barbarian, who is described as a monster of cruelty and licentiousness, went to Constantinople and was duly baptised and received into holy church. Returning to Russia, Vladimir ordered his subjects to proceed at once to the nearest river and be baptized. This imperial decree was implicitly obeyed, and so Russia became Christian and Orthodox, and Christian, and Orthodox Russia has remained to this present day.

The Russian church as it exists to-day is a perfect example of one phase of the imperialized church. In Russia the church has no separate existence; it is simply a function of the state. The Czar is the head of the church. The affairs of the church are in the keeping of a bureau of the government. The officer presiding over this department of state is the High Procurator of the Holy Synod, and is always one of the ablest, as he is one of the most powerful, men in the Empire. Podobenoszew, who has held this office during the reigns of Alexander III. and Nicholas, the present Czar, is one of the makers of the modern world. He ranks as a moulding influence with Gladstone, Bismarck, and Leo XIII. A fanatic by nature and a reactionary from

policy, he, more than any other person, is responsible for the present condition of the Russian Empire. He rules the church with a rod of iron, and looks upon the slightest innovation either in doctrine or in ritual as a crime against the Czar. He was opposed to the emancipation of the serfs, and has set his face rigidly against making any concessions to the liberal sentiment of the country. For ages the church has aided and abetted the state in its cruelties and its tyrannies, and consequently the church is sharing to the full in that hatred which the awakening Russian has for all the institutions of his country. Kropotkin, Tolstoy, and other Russian writers have revealed to us the attitude of the enlightened Russian toward the established church. The sight of the church fills them with loathing and horror. They look upon it as the Judas that has betrayed Jesus. No where in the world are the teachings of Jesus so entirely separated from the doctrines and practices of Christianity as by the Reformers in Russia. Tolstoy is a disciple of Jesus. He believes that in the teaching of Jesus is to be found the salvation of the world. The saying of Jesus, "Resist not evil," is to him, as we have already learned, the cardinal doctrine of the Lord,

the key to His gospel. Tolstoy has forsaken the court, and given up a brilliant worldly career that he might live the truth as it is in Jesus, and Tolstoy has for the church all the contempt and hatred of the nihilist. The doctrines of the church are, in the estimation of the great novelist and thinker, words without meaning; the ceremonies of the church are senseless forms; the government of the church, a grinding tyranny. In his reaction against the existing church, the liberal Russian has gone to the extreme of including what is good and bad, wise and foolish, true and false, in the same condemnation.

But for this, not the revolutionist, but the imperialized, fossilized church, is to blame. The church has betrayed the cause of Jesus and the cause of the people, and the day of reckoning is at hand. The inert mass of the Russian people is moving with the slowness, it may be of a glacier, but, like the glacier, it is moving and grinding under its dead weight, ancient tyrannies and worn-out customs. There is more to hope from Russia than from any other Christian country to-day. Its reformation in the church and revolution in the state are yet to come, and when they do come they will be far more radical than the reformation and revolution in the west.

In the next generation we may look to Russia for a new birth of religion and a new birth of liberty. The doctrine of passive resistance and communistic living have a stronger hold in the great Empire than anywhere else in the world. The bomb-throwing nihilist is simply retarding the movement that is at last to make the Russian the most Christian and democratic of the nations. Before the present century has finished its course Russia will be free both in church and state.

During the present century we may also expect a great awakening throughout the whole eastern church. Influences are at work loosening the iron bonds of orthodoxy which have cramped eastern Christianity since the days of Theodosius; and with the breaking up of orthodoxy will come the revival of religion and the renewal of life. Already the days of Islam are numbered. Mohammedism is a spent force. The religion of Jesus liberated from the swathing bands of pseudo intellectualism and an effete ceremonialism will reconquer the birthplace of Jesus, and make the countries of the east obedient to the faith. But it will be the religion of Jesus, not the religion of the church, that will regenerate the world. The love of the Father and the

love of the brethren will bring peace to distracted nations and churches.

The church in the east, from the days of Theodosius, has been simply a function of the state, and has been used by the state to support the policy of the state. The church has blest the armies of the state, when those armies have gone out to lay waste countries, to burn cities, to murder men, to ravish women, and to enslave children. There is no crime which the church will not condone, so only it is done in the name of the state. From Ivan the Terrible to the Czar Nicholas the autocrat of Russia has found in the clergy the ready instruments of his cruelty and despotism. The clergy are dependent on the Czar and dependence is the fruitful parent of slavery. When the state and the church are one it is always the state that is the one; the church is only a fraction of the unit. An imperial church in an imperial state must either subjugate the state, or be subjugated by the state.

The Supremacy of the Church in the West.

In the year 452, when Rome was in danger of destruction by the hosts of Attila, the Hun, she owed her salvation,* not to the prowess of her Emperor, but to the sanctity of her bishop. The Scourge of God, as Attila was called, had passed through Germany and Gaul, and had left behind him a desolate waste; he crossed the Alps, and had devastated northern Italy. The city of Aquileia, then famous for its commerce and its wealth, had yielded after a stubborn resistance and had been given over to the rage and lust of the Tartar horde that followed the banners of Attila and the barbarians killed the men, carried the women and children captive, burned the buildings, threw down the walls, and left the city a smoking ruin. So complete was their work of destruction that Aquileia from that day ceased to exist. After the fall of Aquileia there was nothing to prevent the march of

*Italy and Her Invaders, T. Hodgkin, bk. 2, chap. IV.

Attila to Rome. He had only to pass over the Appenines, and he would find the city which for ages had ruled the world, unable to offer the least resistance to the invader. The only hope of safety which remained to the panic-striken city lay in the spell which her name still cast upon the rude mind of the barbarian. For, though she had lost her Empire, the city of the Cæsars had not altogether lost her prestige. It was not easy for men to shake off that fear and reverence for the city of Rome which during the period of her dominance had become a habit of mind. Attila himself was afraid of the city; not of her armies, for she had none; not of her citizens, for they were at his mercy; it was the city itself that he feared. Taking advantage of this superstitious awe, Rome sent a deputation of her citizens to reason with the Hun, and to persuade him to cross the Alps and give up his intention of conquering Italy. The spokesman of this deputation was Leo, the Bishop of Rome. So deeply did the venerable appearance of the pontiff impress the barbarian leader that he listened to his eloquence, and yielded to his arguments and turned away, leaving Rome a little breathing time before her final overthrow. This Leo was the first of the great bishops who,

during the next thousand years, built up out of the ruins of the Roman Empire a dominion far more wonderful and enduring than the dominion of the Cæsars. In the days of her greatness Rome gave the world the Cæsars; and in the days of her decline she established the rule of her popes. And of the two the pope was and is the mightier creation.

As the ancient city of Rome believed that it owed its origin to the favor and intervention of the gods, and therefore was divine, so this new institution within the city traced its origin directly to God. The Bishop of Rome was the direct spiritual successor and descendant of Peter; and Peter was the Apostle of Jesus, the Son of God, to whom the Lord had given the keys of the Kingdom of heaven, and upon whom, as upon a rock, He had built His church. It is a matter of indifference whether Peter was ever in Rome or not. It is enough that before the end of the second century the whole Christian church believed that he had been in Rome, and that the Roman church, if it did not owe to him its foundation, was nevertheless under his Episcopal rule for the first twenty-five years of its existence. That the church of Rome should be looked upon as the most important of all the churches was the natural

result of the place which the city held in the world. It was the center of Roman life. It was a saying that all roads lead to Rome. From every district of the Empire men were constantly going to or coming from the imperial city. The doings of the city furnished talk for the world. Every movement, religious, political, and social, made a home for itself in Rome, that from Rome it might reach out and influence the world. That Christianity was not an exception to this rule follows as a matter of course. The new religion found a soil rich for the sowing of the seed of truth.* Rome was the home of nearly 10,000 Jews who had their dwelling place in the quarter called the Trastevere about the base of the Janiculum. This colony of the Hebrews had then, as the Hebrews have now and always, an influence far out of proportion to their numbers. Their race characteristics have not changed in all the centuries. Then, as now, they were a people apart, separated from the world about them by their religious faith and religious practice. The Jews in Rome seem to have been severe and simple in their life and

*Epistle to the Romans, Paul, chap. 1.

thought. They did not, as the Jews in Alexandria and other centers of Greek culture, seek to accommodate the faith of their fathers to Greek ways of thought. They held tenaciously to the traditions of the elders and waited patiently for the redemption of Israel. When the Christian apostle came to Rome he found there men and women of the same characteristics, having the same hopes and fears as the men of Judea and Galilee. The same aspirations that lead to the eager acceptance of the Messiahship of Jesus in Jerusalem gave to that Messiahship a welcome in the city of Rome. In Rome, as elsewhere, there was a fringe of Gentile life attached to the garment of Judaism. Men of every nation listened with awe to the teaching of the prophets, and feared and reverenced the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. It was this Gentile fringe that yielded itself to the preaching of the messengers of Christ, and it was really out of this fringe that the apostles and prophets of the Lord made the new garment of Christianity. There is nothing in the history of the world more interesting to the imagination than this movement in the population in the Trastevere in Rome. We can see as in a moving picture men of the character of Peter, simple men,

conscious of a divine mission, moving in and out among the crowded population of this obscure region of the city; telling, almost whispering, into eager ears their story of the life and death of Jesus, of His resurrection, of His ascension into heaven, and of His expected and speedy return to judge the world in righteousness; to cast down the mighty from their seat, and to exalt the humble and meek. Nowhere could such preaching make its way as it could in this mass of people who had nothing whatever to hope from the world as it was. Nothing but a change as great as that which the coming of Christ would usher in could satisfy these hearts, embittered as they were by the hardness of their lives. The apocalyptic message of Christianity with its crash of worlds was the only message that could rouse these people from their apathy and despair.

The doctrine of the brotherhood of man found a ready response in old Rome, cherishing as it did its democratic instincts. The thirst for distinction, the horror of oblivion and annihilation, were powerful motives moving men to lay hold of the hope that was set before them.

The preaching of Christianity was followed at once by the organization of the church. The Christ-

ian folk became a peculiar people, living a singular life in startling contrast with the life of the city in which they dwelt. In Rome, but not of Rome, these Christians had their meeting places in the cemeteries where the dead were buried. For centuries the Roman church worshiped God in the darkness of the Catacombs. Those vast subterraneous chambers underneath the city that to-day astonish the visitor are largely the work of the primitive Christian. In them he hid himself from the wrath of the Emperor and the populace, in them he set up his altar and offered his sacrifice, and in them he laid his dead to sleep in the Lord Jesus. A people living in this way could not help generating a spirit of devotion that would in time master the world.

In its organization the Roman church followed the plan of the synagogue, which was the model of the church throughout the world. The bishop, the presbyters, and the deacons ministered to the church in government, in teaching, and in charity. The bishops were the head of the church, having the oversight of its affairs; the presbyters were the hands of the church, breaking the bread of life; the

deacons were the feet of the church, running upon its errands of mercy.*

From the first, and of necessity, the bishops of the church in Rome were the leaders of the Christian movement in the world. Being in the shadow of the imperial palace, they were the first to suffer from the outbreaks of imperial wrath. To be chosen bishop of Rome in the days of persecution was an honor only to those who saw in death a way to glory. During the early period of its history the average length of an episcopate was eight years, and to nearly all of those who served the church in the days of her adversity tradition assigns the crown of martyrdom. It was this devotion of the Bishops of Rome to the cause of Christ that gave them their leadership.

When Constantine gave peace to the church, the Roman see was already venerable in the sight of all Christendom. Legend and history combined to make it the holy city of the Christian world. Jerusalem the home of Christianity was in ruins. Nazareth and Bethlehem were obscure provincial towns. It was in Rome that the Christian imagina-

*This perfected organization was the work of the second and third centuries.

tion created the world of wonder and miracle in which the human mind was to live for the next thousand years. Already Jesus was exalted to the right hand of God. He was no longer the Son of Man. He was the Second Person of the Holy Trinity. He was far above and out of the reach of man. He, the intercessor, needed someone to intercede with Him. In Peter and Paul the church found its human origin. Especially in Peter; for as Paul was the founder of Christian theology, so was Peter the founder of the Christian church. The Bishop of Rome looked upon himself, not as the successor of Christ, but as the successor of Peter.

When the seat of empire was removed from Rome to Constantinople it left the church of Rome free to develop its own life in accordance with its own genius. The Bishop of Constantinople was the creature of the Emperor, the subservient instrument of imperial power. The Bishop of Rome was independent; he was more than this; he was the most considerable personage in the city of Rome,—its real ruler and guide. He exercised, not only the power which came to him from Peter, but he inherited all the traditions and privileges of republican and imperial Rome. He was the successor both of Peter

and of Cæsar. Unless we clearly grasp the fact that the Roman church is the heir of the Roman Empire, we cannot understand her history, nor the history of the world. From the very first the Roman bishops were conscious of their double inheritance. In season and out of season they insisted that, as bishops of Rome and successors of Peter, they were entitled to the submission of the Christian world, nor was the Christian world slow to admit their claim. The habit of submission to Rome was a part of the Cæsarean heritage which came as an heirloom to the see of Rome; and when to that was added the admitted primacy of Peter the way of the Bishop of Rome was made easy. He called himself the Bishop of Bishops, the servant of servants, and from the seventh century he claimed and was allowed the name of Papa, or Pope of all the church, and Papa or Pope he remains to the present day.

The condition of the world, as well as the traditions of the church, favored the pretentions of the Roman see. The Roman church was the creation of Divine Providence. The world needed the church to such a degree that without the church we cannot see how the modern western world could have come into existence.

With the fall of the western Empire in the year 476 the state in the old Roman conception of the word, ceased to be. There was no longer any state in Europe; nothing that could stand, about which human life could center, and upon which human society could rest. For the next eight hundred years Europe was in a state of anarchy. During all those ages there was no center of unity, no stable authority. There was no cities of any consequence, for the men of those ages lived in wagons, and were constantly on the move. There were no fixed boundaries between country and country. Every month saw a new distribution of territory, and every decade the rise and fall of a Kingdom. The inhabitants of Europe were without a history, without a literature, without a home. The languages of Dante, of Voltaire, of Shakespeare and Luther, were as yet unwritten. They existed only as the illiterate speech of the common people, and as the uncouth jargon of the barbarian.

Now in the midst of this confusion there was one center of order, one source of authority, one region of light; and this center of order, this source of authority, this region of light, was the Christian church, as that church was centered in the see of

Rome. It is the fashion of those who are outside her pale to ascribe the ascendency of the Roman church to the guileful ambition of her pontiffs. But the student of history knows that the great phenomena of history do not admit of so simple an explanation. We can as well lay the 6 foot 3 of the Maine lumberman to his personal ambition as ascribe the dominance of the Roman see to the personal ambition of the Roman bishops. Their ambition was not the cause, it was the consequence, of their supremacy. Institutions, like individuals, are born, and live, and die in obedience to unchangeable biological laws, and neither institution nor individual, by taking thought, can add one cubit to its stature.

Speaking of the reign of Leo I., Charles Gore* says: "Circumstances were thrusting greatness upon the see of St. Peter; the glory of the Empire was passing into her hands, the distracted churches of Spain and Africa harassed and torn in pieces by barbarian hordes and wearied with heresies, were in no position to assert independence in any matter, and were only too glad to look to any center whence a measure of strength and organization seemed to

*Leo the Great, C. Gore, chaps. VI., VII.

radiate. And the popes had not been slow in rising to welcome and promote the greatness with which the current and tendency of the age was investing them." So far were the popes from being the authors of their own greatness that we may almost say that the Papacy existed, not because of them, but in spite of them.

Only a very few men of the 200 and more who have occupied the see of Rome, have been men of marked ability. Most of them were men of the caliber of Polk, and Pierce, rather than Washington and Lincoln. Leo the First was one of these greater men of the Papacy. He had the zeal of a priest combined with the administrative capacity of an Augustus. He laid down the lines that the Roman see has followed ever since in the establishment and maintenance of its Empire. Leo was above all things a governor and an administrator. He had a law of ecclesiastical discipline and a supreme canon of dogmatic truth, and these were his instruments to subdue a troubled world. He cast the spell of authority upon the mind, as well as the will and actions, of men. He regulated the thoughts, as well as the deeds, of his subjects. The Popes of Rome gave their haughty accord to the decrees of

Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, and gained for themselves the championship of Orthodoxy. They did not waste their strength in the discussion of the questions which tore the church in the east to ribbons, but they waited until the discussion ended in decision, and then they made that decision their own. They had none of the dialectic restlessness of the Greek. They were plain, practical men of affairs, and managed the church as their fathers had managed the Republic and Empire.

After the death of Leo in 461, we do not reach another great Pope until the accession of Gregory in 590. If Leo was the organizer of the Papacy, Gregory was its missionary. The age of Gregory was the age of Catholic expansion. Himself a man of holy life and consecrated genius, he inspired the whole western world with his own zeal. It was Gregory who sent missionaries into England, and converted the Saxon and the Angle to the Catholic faith. He assumed as a matter of right and duty pastoral oversight of Europe. More than 850 of his letters remain to attest his pastoral industry and faithfulness. He administered the vast estates of

the church with the fidelity of an accountant. His sacramentary is the source of our Collects, and his musical arrangement of the service survives to this present day as the most dignified type of sacred song.

For a century and more after the death of Gregory the church felt the impulse of his life. The sixth and seventh centuries was the great missionary period of the western church. During this era all of the nations of Europe, with the exception of the Scandinavian, were converted to the faith, and Europe became passionately Catholic and Christian. Then began what we call the Ages of Faith. The belief in God, in Christ, in judgment, in heaven, in hell, in angels, in devils, was not in that pale thing that goes by the name of belief in the churches, Catholic and Protestant, of to-day, but it was an overmastering conviction, leaving no room for hesitation or doubt. It was especially this belief in hell that drove men by the thousand into the wilderness to bewail their sins, that created the character of the monk and the nun, and gave rise to the monastic orders. Christianity of the seventh, eighth, and four following centuries took the words of Christ literally, and sought to obey them implicitly. Men took

the vows of chastity, poverty, and obedience, and surrendered themselves without reserve to the service of God. We cannot in this lecture treat at large of the history of the monastic orders. We mention them because the monastic orders were the means by which the popes established their dominion over Europe. Every monastery was a fortress, every monk was a soldier devoted to the interests of Papacy. During this whole period it was the one purpose of the papal policy to make the state simply a function of the church. In the city of Rome the bishops had acquired temporal as well as spiritual authority, and there the civil was necessarily subordinate to the spiritual power.

The Pope was a priest first and a magistrate afterward. The temporal power of the church had its origin in a grant of territory by Pepin, King of the Franks, to Pope Stephen III. Stephen had fled from Rome to escape from the hands of the Lombards, who had established themselves in northern Italy, and were pressing toward Rome with the intention of making that city the capital of their Kingdom. At the earnest solicitation of Stephen, Pepin invaded the land of the Lombards, defeated

them in battle, and drove them beyond the Appenines. The territory in the neighborhood of Rome, wrested from the Lombards, was given by the Frankish King to the Pope, to be held and enjoyed by the Apostolic see forever. This donation of Pepin was the origin of the states of the church, which formed the Pope's patrimony, and which he ruled as a temporal sovereign until the year 1871. when the states of the church were merged into the Kingdom of Italy, and Rome became the capital of that Kingdom. The Papal territory was increased by a substantial gift made by the son of Pepin, Karl the Great, to the successor of Stephen. This King, better known by his French name of Charlemagne, was called into Italy to complete the work of delivering the Papacy from the fear of the Lombards. Karl, who was the greatest of the medieval monarchs, broke the power of the Lombards, and added northern Italy to his own dominions.

At this time an event occurred which profoundly influenced the history of Europe for the next thousand years. Karl the Great visited Italy in the winter of 800. On Christmas eve, as he was kneeling at mass, the Pope, Leo III. placed upon his head

the imperial crown, and he was hailed as Cæsar Augustus. This revival of the Empire by the act of the Pope in thus placing the crown on the head of the Frankish King was fraught with bitter consequences both to Italy and Germany. The German monarchs, following the phantom of Empire, neglected to consolidate and organize their own proper Kingdom, so that while France, England, and Spain were growing into well compacted nations, Germany was and remained until 1870 a conglomeration of petty dukedoms owing nominal allegiance to the Emperor, but in reality independent each of the other, without any central government to regulate internal affairs, or to defend the German from foreign aggression. Italy, nominally the home and land of the Emperor, suffered from the same evils that afflicted Germany. Divided into a number of petty states, warring with one another, constantly calling in the barbarian from beyond the Alps to settle its family quarrels, Italy was the battle ground of Europe for a thousand years. The Holy Roman Empire which Leo set up in the person of Karl, and which was nothing but the ghost of the Empire of the Cæsars, and of which Voltaire said wittily that it was neither holy Roman nor an empire, haunted

the political life of Europe for just a thousand and six years. It was created by the act of Leo in the year 800; it was dissolved by a decree of Napoleon in the year 1806. Germany and Italy had to wait nearly a century longer before they could come to their own. Both of these countries were unified as a consequence of the Franco-Prussian war of 1870.

This act of Leo had a powerful influence upon the relation of the church and state. From that time the Popes began to claim the right to crown and discrown Emperors and Kings. It required two hundred years for the Papacy to make good its claim to universal sovereignty.

With the death of Karl his Empire was dissolved, and western Europe fell once more into anarchic confusion. The next two centuries are the darkest and most disgraceful in the history of western Christendom. For a time it seemed as if Europe was to sink back into a hopeless irreclaimable barbarism. The city of Rome shared to the full in the general confusion. It was during this period that the two houses of Colonna and Orsini made the streets of Rome their battle ground, and divided the city into hostile factions. The Papacy was the

shuttlecock of the contending parties; beaten to and fro by their battledores, it lost all dignity and all authority within the city. Popes were set up and cast down as this or that party was in the ascendant, until at last the see of Peter was in the gift of the most celebrated courtesan of the age, Theodora, and her equally depraved daughters, Theodora the younger, and Mariposa. That the holy see should have recovered its prestige after this awful degradation is owing to the fact that Europe knew little of what was going on in Rome, and to the further fact that Europe had no other center of unity, no other hope of salvation. When things were at their worst a great revival of religion took place in the monasteries. While all the world was given over to lust and rapine, the serious and the sin sick fled from the world as from the wrath of God and sought the salvation of their souls in the seclusion and sanctity of the monastery. Among the monasteries remarkable for severity of rule and purity of life none surpassed the Monastery of Cluny in Burgundy. The Emperor, Henry III., seeking for a man to whom he might intrust the government of the church with some hope of its reformation and restoration fixed upon Bruno, Bishop of Toul as the person

most likely to effect his purpose. Bruno went to the city of Rome as a simple priest, and would not assume the office until he was chosen by the clergy and confirmed by the people of his see city. He would owe his episcopate, not to the appointment of the Emperor, but to the free choice of his flock. With Bruno there went to Rome as his chief adviser a man infinitely greater than himself, who was destined to inaugurate and carry out the reformation of the church which the Emperor desired, and then to bring Emperor and Empire into subjection to the see of Rome. Hildebrand, the monk of Cluny, was one of those men whose lives make epochs in the world's history. Holding the office of Archdeacon of Rome during five successive pontificates, he shaped the policy of the Papacy from 1056 to 1122, reigning himself as Pope under the name of Gregory VII. for thirty-eight years from 1074 to his death in 1122. Thus for sixty-six years the papal see was under the dominion of one great master mind. Hildebrand was a churchman. He saw in the church the only hope of the world. He asserted and enforced every claim that had been made for the Apostolic see since the foundation of the church in Rome. The Pope, as the successor of Peter, was

the vicar of Christ and the vicegerent of God. He was the actual living voice of God in the world; he held in his hand the keys of the Kingdom of heaven, whosesoever sins he remitted they were remitted, and whosesoever sins he retained they were retained. In his warfare on behalf of the church the Pope made use of two powers, the full resource of which is incomprehensible to the modern mind. These weapons of papal warfare were excommunication and the interdict. By excommunication a man was cut off from the congregation of God's people, and sentenced to temporal and eternal damnation. The excommunicate was an outlaw and outcast. It was a crime to hold any intercourse with him or to give him so much as a cup of cold water; and to die excommunicate was to fall at once and forever into the hands of the devil, and to burn eternally in the fire prepared for this same devil and his angels. Imagine, if you can, the horror of one who was thus shut out from the love of God and the love of man. A belief in the power of the priesthood to determine the eternal misery of the human soul, gave to the church a mastery over mankind beside which all other mastery is as the little finger of Solomon to the thigh of Rehoboam. And we

must remember that for more than a thousand years all Europe lived in terror of the papal and priestly curse.

The excommunication was aimed at rebellious individuals; the interdict at recalcitrant cities and countries. When a city or country offended the papal majesty, the Pope forbade the celebration of the offices of the church in the place which was subject to his displeasure. No church-bell called the people to prayer, new-born children went unbaptized, the presence of Christ was taken from the altar, the bride went to an unblest marriage bed, and the dead were laid in unhallowed graves. Imagine again, if you can, the horror of a community under interdict that believed with all its heart and soul and mind that its temporal and eternal salvation depended upon the due and proper celebration of the offices of the church, and which accepted the curse of the Pope as the judgment of God. No visitation of the plague was to be compared in its effect upon the happiness of the people with this visitation of the wrath of the vicar of God.

The Popes won this their authority over the people by using it in the first instance for the better government of the world and the salvation of the people.

Hildebrand wielded this awful power of the church to destroy two great evils, as he considered them, which were sapping the moral life of the church and the world. The first of these abuses was the marriage, or, as he called it the concubinage, of the clergy. He would put between the clergy and the layman an impassible gulf. He would have the clergyman renounce his natural instincts and still the strongest cravings of his heart. He, the clergyman, must leave father and mother, and wife and children, and houses and lands, and devote himself as a whole burnt offering on the altar of the Lord. That Hildebrand succeeded, even partially, in forcing his system upon the church is a tribute to his genius and to his indomitable will. No one, I think, will claim that Hildebrand succeeded in securing the perfect chastity of the clerical order, but the celibacy of that order has been the invariable rule from the days of Hildebrand to the present hour; and to that rule more than to any other fact may be ascribed the solidarity and continuity of the Catholic church. For more than a thousand years that church has never wanted men and women who were ready to sacrifice everything to the cause of the church; who have no life other

than her life, no interests other than her interests, and it is with this army of devoted men and women that the world has had to deal since and before the time of Gregory VII., and, so far as we can see, will have to deal until Christian time is no more.

The other abuse which roused the anger of Hildebrand, and in the suppression of which he gained a decisive victory for the Papacy, was simony or the sale of ecclesiastical offices. The civil power in the person of the Emperor, the King, or the duke, claimed the right to invest the clergyman into the temporalities of his benefice, and until he was so invested the bishop or the priest could not receive any income from his living. Large sums were paid by the clergy to secure this investiture until it came to pass that ecclesiastical offices were subjects of barter, and had a regular price in the market. Hildebrand struck at the root of this evil by denying the right of the layman to invest the clergyman into his temporalities, and excommunicating every laymen who should presume to so invest a cleric, and every cleric who should submit to such investiture. As this decree of the Pope deprived the civil power of a large revenue, and as it made the whole body of the clergy independent of the state, it naturally

roused the opposition of the temporal authorities. The conflict that raged round this question of lay investiture went on for more than a century, and when it ended the substantial victory was with the Papacy. The clergy were freed from the exactions of the state officials; they paid taxes, not to the state, but to the church only, and owed allegiance to no one but the Pope. One of the most dramatic episodes in history is the submission of Henry IV., Emperor and King, to Pope Gregory VII. Excommunicated by the church, abandoned by his army, forsaken by his people, this war lord came to Canosa, in the Appenines where the Pope was staying and for three days stood outside the palace, barefoot in the snow until the haughty prelate was ready to receive him and grudgingly grant him a pardon. This scene at Canosa made a lasting impression on the imagination of Europe. It was an unmistakable sign of the triumph of the Pope.

After the death of Hildebrand his power was transmitted to a line of successors who pursued his policy with unflinching determination. With the reign of Innocent III., 1198–1216, the Papacy

reached its highest point in power and in glory. This prelate, chosen Pope in the prime of life, a man of commanding genius and unblemished character, was during his pontificate the real ruler of Europe. He interfered in the most minute details of political and domestic life. He excommunicated kings and laid nations under interdict if they in any way roused his displeasure. He consolidated the power of the clergy, and made the government of Europe sacerdotal. His legates sat in council with the Kings and directed their policy. John of England yielded his crown to the Pandulph, the papal legate, and received it back as the Pope's man. During the reign of Innocent impetus was given to the study of canon law, which was amplified into a vast and complicated system. It was the only code of law binding on the clergy, and it interfered at every possible point with the lives of the laity. By assuming to itself the regulation of marriage the church laid its hand upon the very source of life, and by its power of dispensation was able to bind or dissolve at its will.

The power of the popes in the thirteenth century was far greater than that of the Cæsars. The state

had become in a large measure simply a function of the church. Princes were subordinate to priests, and the Pope could say that he was indeed the vicar of that Christ who was King of Kings and Lord of Lords.

The Fall of Mediaeval Church.*

The year 1300 was in more senses than one the golden year of the Roman papacy. The long conflict between the imperial and papal powers had ended in the triumph of the pope. The ruin of the house of Hohenstauffen had involved the ruin of the empire. The last of the seed of Barbarossa, the gallant Conradin, had died upon the scaffold in Naples, bequeathing his wrongs, all that was left him of the vast possessions of his fathers, to his kindred of the house of Aragon.

So low was the imperial power and dignity that the reigning emperor, Adolph of Nassau, poorest and weakest of German princes, was rated by the pope like a school-boy for becoming the hired soldier of Edward of England.

The spiritual, if not the temporal, power of the pope was acknowledged without dispute from one end of Europe to the other. A vast and highly

*This lecture was delivered before the Church Club in New York and published in the Church Club lectures of the year 1894. It is republished here by permission.

organized priesthood looked to him as the sole source of its authority. The regular clergy waited upon his favor for promotion; the monastic orders were, for the most part, under his immediate jurisdiction, while the mendicants of S. Francis and S. Dominic preached him in every hamlet and at every cross-road of Europe. The fear of him and the dread of him was upon all the nations of the West. His curse had ruined an empire and was withering the power of kings.

The Crusades had given into his hand the sword of the flesh as well as the sword of the Spirit. He had but to call a war holy, to grant general indulgence to his soldiers, and to bless their banners, and he was followed by devoted armies that could fight and die, if they could not fast and pray. Failing in his effort to wrest the Holy Land from the infidel, the pope had turned these, his carnal weapons, against heretics and personal enemies nearer home; he preached his crusades indifferently against the Albigenses of Provence and the Colonna of Rome.

And in the year 1300 a new device was found to attract to Rome the homage and wealth of Europe. In some mysterious way the news went abroad that

whosoever should, in that last year of the old century, visit the holy city and worship at the altars of the Apostles, would receive full indulgence and pardon for all his sin. The consequence of this rumor was a mighty movement toward Rome. On the 22d of February the pope, by special "Bull," confirmed the belief of the people, and the streets of his city were thronged with pilgrims, and the basilicas of the Apostles crowded with worshippers. It is estimated that as many as two hundred and fifty thousand strangers were in Rome on a given day, and more than two millions visited the city during the Jubilee.

The reigning pope was Benedict Cajetan of the town of Anagni. His immediate predecessor was Peter Morrone, that hermit of Abruzzi, whom the cardinals had chosen as if by inspiration, after a disgraceful struggle, which had kept the see of Rome vacant for more than two years, in the hope that the sanctity of Peter would sweeten the air of the Roman court. But no sooner did the hermit take his name of Celestine V. and enter upon his high and holy office, than he found that the papacy

had passed far out of the regions of piety into that of practical politics. Frightened by his vast responsibilities, instigated by the advice, if not hurried on by the wiles of Cajetan, Celestine resigned the papacy after a reign of six months. This resignation was made in Naples, where the Pope was then residing, and was accepted by the College of Cardinals, who, after a negotiation lasting for ten days, entered into conclave, and, without further delay, elected the ablest of their number, Benedict Cajetan, Cardinal Presbyter of S. Martin, to the vacant see.

In a few days the newly elected pontiff was crowned, assuming the name of Boniface VIII., and hurried away to Rome. He carried in his train Charles, King of Naples, and Charles Martel, his son, King of Hungary. As the Pope neared the city, the people came forth to meet him with banners and with music, and his entrance was like an ancient triumph. The two kings led his horse by the bridle and afterward waited on him at table.

The pope was then at the summit of earthly greatness. He was by far the most considerable personage in Europe, if not in the world; his only rival, the emperor, he had reduced to insignificance, while the kings of the West had not yet tried their

strength against him. But his was not the glory of the morning, it was the passing glory of the evening, the splendor of a sun that was going down.

When Boniface entered upon his office he found three centres of disturbance: In Rome the Colonna stood aloof, the Sicilians were in rebellion, and the King of France was sullen.

From the eleventh century the Colonna had been the strongest and wealthiest of Roman families. The Orsini were its only rivals in riches and in influence: it had its strongholds within and without the city; it allied itself by marriage to royal and imperial blood; it gave popes and cardinals to the Church. At the election of Boniface two cardinals of the family, James, and Peter the nephew of James, had been the last to give their consent; they had even hinted that the election itself might be illegal. The resignation of Celestine was without precedent in the history of the papacy. It was whispered in the conclave and soon came to be the talk of the street that a pope could not resign. Having once clothed himself with the awful power of the vicar of Christ, he could no more resign that power than God Himself could resign His justice

and his mercy. And the true pope was not in Rome but in Abruzzi.

These evil reports Boniface traced or thought he traced, to the lips of the Colonna. He summoned them to his council. They refused to obey, openly maintaining that he was no true pope; asserting that Celestine was pope and only on the death of Celestine could his successor be elected. The pope answered their defiance by degradation and excommunication; he deprived the cardinals of their hats and cut off the whole Colonna family from the communion of the Church. The Colonna offered to submit to the pope, but he would not receive their submission, except they would surrender all their strongholds both within and without the city and throw themselves upon his mercy. This, naturally, they refused to do, and Boniface preached a crusade against them, he tore down their houses, stormed their castles, destroyed their chief city, Prenestre, and drove the family to take refuge with the King of France. One member of the family, Sciarra Colonna, was taken captive by the Saracens and he concealed his identity lest they should deliver him to Boniface, as he preferred the galleys of the infidel to the dungeons of the true believer. He finally

escaped into France, from whence he returned to take vengeance on the persecutor of his family. The pope had made a fatal mistake, he had angered but not destroyed these doubters of his title.

Here is not the place to unravel the interesting and intricate history of Sicily. Its exposed position has always made it an easy conquest. It had seen Carthaginian, Greek, Roman and Saracenic masters. In the tenth century, the Norman added it to the number of his conquests and founded there one of his numerous kingdoms. Early in the thirteenth century the line of Norman kings ended in Constance, wife of the Emperor Henry V., son of Barbarossa. Henry claimed the Island of Sicily, together with the kingdom of Naples, in the right of his wife, and what Henry claimed he conquered. He left the kingdoms of Naples and of Sicily to his wonderful son, Frederick II., who made this home of his mother his home, and ruled Germany and the empire from the shores of the Mediterranean.

It was in their long contest with Frederick that the popes claimed the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily as a fief of the papacy and granted them first to Richard of Cornwall, and afterwards to Charles of Anjou and Provence. After the death of Fred-

erick, while his son Conrad was in Germany, striving to secure the empire, and Manfred, natural son of Frederick, had usurped and was reigning over Naples and Sicily, Charles invaded the kingdom, Manfred was defeated and slain, and the power of the French established both on the main land and in the island. But in Sicily that power was of short duration. The extreme and brutal tyranny of the French stirred the southern blood to madness. An insult to a lady of Palermo was the immediate occasion of that terrible uprising known as the Sicilian Vespers, which left not a Frenchman alive on the island, whom the Sicilians could find and kill. Conrad V., son of Frederick II., was dead. His son, the little Conrad, perished in his gallant effort to regain the kingdom of his fathers and there was no heir to the great house of Hohenstauffen, except Constance, daughter of Manfred, who was married to Peter of Aragon. To Aragon the Sicilian turned for help and offered their crown to Peter, the husband of Constance. He accepted it and granted it in his turn to his brother James, with a reversion in favor of his younger brother Frederick. This Frederick of Aragon was the real ruler of Sicily until his death. James soon suc-

ceeded his brother Peter on the throne of Aragon and left Frederick to govern Sicily.

When Boniface became pope he succeeded in making peace between James of Aragon and Charles of Naples, one of the conditions of the peace being that James should cede his rights in Sicily to Charles. But in making this peace the pope reckoned without Frederick and the Sicilians. The Sicilians he treated as his vassals, to be granted to whom he would, and Frederick he tried to beguile by offering him, with the hand of the titular Empress of Constantinople, the empire of the East. But Frederick thought a kingdom in the hand worth an empire in the bush, and held fast to his tight little island, while the Sicilians would rather die than admit the French again to their homes.

Frederick defied the pope and the two kings, though one was his brother. His great Admiral Roger Loria defeated the combined papal and Neapolitan fleets and drove them from the sea. And when Loria was seduced from his allegiance by the pope, Frederick, though no longer invincible at sea, was unconquerable on land. The pope thundered out against him every curse to be found in the arsenal of Rome, but Frederick let him curse, and

went on beating Charles of Naples just the same. The pope called Charles of Valois to aid his feeble kinsman of Naples, but this Frenchman did nothing but devastate Italy, and increase the hatred that was gathering about the head of Boniface, and went home leaving Frederick in secure possession of Sicily.

I have dwelt upon the story of Sicily because in that story is the secret of the papal downfall. In their long effort to wrest Naples and Sicily from the Hohenstauffen, the popes had wasted their spiritual and temporal strength. They delivered themselves from the fear of one master, only to find themselves given over, bound hand and foot, into the keeping of another.

In the break-up of the Frankish empire, which resulted in the foundation of the Kingdom of France, that kingdom was ever the favorite of Rome. In their long and bitter struggle with the empire, it was to France that the popes looked for succor, and that aid was paid for by many special grants and dispensations.

But now that the empire no longer threatened his autocracy, the pope determined to humble this

growing power in the West, which presuming on his favor had not consulted his dignity.

The reigning King of France was Philip IV., known to history as Philip the Fair. This king was one of those men whose lives strike the midnight hour that marks the beginning of a new day. In his time and under his hand, three institutions which had ruled the life and filled the heart of Christian Europe for three hundred years and more fell into ruin.

The stars in their courses fought with Philip in his work of destruction. Victory and defeat alike helped him off with the old and on with the new. His armies met with a terrible disaster under the walls of Courtrai and more than two-thirds of the nobility of France perished on that field of spurs. But the death of the nobility was the life of the king. The wars with England and with Flanders did for France what the Wars of the Roses did for England. In those wars the great families were swept away, and with them that institution which was the source of their power and which they, in turn, upheld by their strength. That graded system which came in

with the Goth and the Frank, in which the king was only a chief of chieftains, his power resting on that of the great nobles next below him, did not survive the fatalities of the fatal fourteenth century. In England, France and Spain, the king and the people absorbed the power of the nobles; in Italy and Germany the nobles and the cities seized upon the power of the king. After Courtrai, the King of France could no longer rest upon the great feudal lords, for the heads of their houses were for the most part little boys and girls. It was no longer a high-spirited and reluctant nobility whom the king led to the battle, it was a hired and professional soldiery. From that day to this, the battles of Europe, with rare exceptions, have not been fought with love and loyalty, but with muscle and money. Philip found the feudal system old and weak, he left it a ruin.

Chivalry was in his day already a matter for sport. The knight errant was the favorite butt of the court fool. What little life was left in that one time beautiful institution found shelter in the great lay orders of the Knights of the Temple and the Knights of the Hospital of S. John. But these orders were themselves falling into dissolution; they

were no longer fulfilling the purpose of their creation. It is not necessary nor possible to believe the awful charges which were brought against the Templars by the king. One charge was sufficient. They were rich and the king was poor, and Philip was not at all nice in his ways of getting money; he would debase the coin, draw the teeth of a Jew, or burn a Templar, so only he might have the money to carry on his wars. And because the Templars were false to their ideal they fell an easy prey to the rapacious tyranny of the king. The destruction of the order of the Temple was the last of Chivalry. It perished in the ashes of Molay.

But it was in the order of Providence that Philip should fight a fiercer battle and win a more far-reaching victory. He was the avenger of emperors and kings upon popes and priests.

It was a question of money that led to the quarrel between Philip and Boniface which ended in the captivity of the papacy. Philip's empty treasury was ever crying for more, and he looked with envious eyes upon the vast possessions of the Church and grieved his heart over the stream of gold and silver that flowed from France to Rome. After taxing everything else he determined to tax the Church,

and demanded of the clergy a fiftieth of their revenues. This act of the king the pope considered to be an invasion of his rights, and in his wrath he issued his "Bull" *Clericis Laicos,* in which he asserted the broad principle that no temporal ruler had any right to impose any tax upon the property of the Church, and he excommunicated every prince or State that should levy such a tax, and every ecclesiastic who should presume to pay it without the permission of the pope. This "Bull" was couched in language insulting to the laity in general and to the King of France in particular. The king answered the papal "Bull" with a decree no less peremptory, forbidding the export from his kingdom of gold and silver coin and military stores without the king's consent. This cut off a chief source of papal revenue, and the pope was forced to temporize. Philip could get along more easily without the pope's communion than he without Philip's gold. The pope hastened to explain that he did not mean to forbid the payment of feudal imposts or voluntary donations of the clergy, or taxes imposed with the pope's consent. He still held that the pope had exclusive jurisdiction over all Church men and Church property, and declared Philip excommunicate for

intruding into that jurisdiction. Philip answered with force, that if he were to fight the battles and defend the property of the Church, the Church must in all justice pay part of the expense. And there the quarrel rested. Philip had his money and the pope did not enforce his excommunication, and there was truce between France and Rome. But it was only that the combatants might breathe themselves for the death-struggle. Between these there was an irrepressible conflict. Philip was set with all the force of his arrogant will upon being sole master in France, while Boniface with fiercer will was determined to be master of France, Philip and all the world.

In the year 1300, when pilgrims from every land did him homage, the heart of Boniface was filled with that desire for universal dominion which makes men mad. If he was the vicar of God on earth, he *was* the vicar of God, with divine right to rule over both the bodies and souls of men, and he could not bear that the eldest son of the Church should dispute his right to dominion, and he was minded to punish that son and make him obedient to his spiritual father.

But Philip was in no filial nor compliant mood. He demanded homage of the Vicomte of Narbonne and the Bishop of Magelounne, both liegemen of the pope, and when they refused he cast them into prison. Enraged at this, Boniface sent his legate, the Bishop of Pamiers, to rebuke the king for his rebellious conduct. The Bishop was insolent and Philip placed him under arrest and sent him to keep company with Narbonne and Magelounne. The pope then issued his "Bull" *Ausculta Fili,* upbraiding Philip in the stern tones of a master. This "Bull" Philip burned amidst the applause of his people in the streets of Paris.

In his contest with the pope the king was forced to appeal to the people. For the first time he assembled the States General, calling representatives of the common people—men of the third estate—to sit with the nobles in the council of the king. There were three new-born forces fighting with and for Philip that Boniface knew not of. They were the spirit of nationalism, the power of secular learning and the might of worldly wealth. Philip set the nation against the Church; the lawyer against the clergy; the merchant against the monk; and under his leadership these gained a victory which has

given them the dominion of the world even to this day.

The emperors were feeble in the presence of the pope because they had no firm foundation to rest upon. Their empire was an idea rather than a fact; their dominion in the air rather than upon the earth. They were titular lords over many nations and hardly masters of one. They could not appeal to love of home and country, because they themselves had no home nor country. The Swabian emperor was a stranger in his own capital city of Rome. But not so the King of France; he was a Frenchman who ruled over Frenchmen and he could cry to them in their own tongue, Shall we the people of France be subject to an Italian priest? And with one consent the people answered, No—we will be ruled by our own king and by our own laws. The nation became conscious of itself in this quarrel with Boniface.

The very clergy yielded to the new spirit that was abroad in the earth. They had to yield because virtue had gone out of them. They were no longer what they had been. Once they were the only men of learning in the world; their lips kept knowledge and the people came to them for wisdom. They had created and then interpreted that vast volume of

canon law by which the popes ruled in the earth. But in the days of Philip they were opposed by a body of men as learned and far more eager than themselves. The University of Bologna had sent into every nation the students and the advocates of the civil law. These found in the institutes and pandects of Justinian every warrant for the king as the head of the State and no warrant for the pope's temporal authority. In the days of Justinian the pope had nothing to do with the taxes. And the lawyers, being the new men were stronger and fiercer than the clergy and beat them in their own chosen field.

And then this king had with him the merchants, the men of wealth. Before the crusades there had been little or no wealth in Western and Northern Europe. There had been a rude plenty to eat and drink, but no luxuries or refinements of life. But the crusades opened the East to the West, and silks and spices came from the Levant to Venice and from thence were sold to the nations of the North. And then the cities which were the home of the merchant began to grow stronger than the castle of the noble and the convent of the monk, and the purse of the merchant to outweigh the sword of the knight

and the missal of the priest; and the merchant in this fight was with the king.

Ignorant of the new and mighty forces arrayed against him, Boniface chose this moment to make such claims for himself and for his office as had never been made in the earth. To settle at once and forever the unlimited power of the pope over all men both in things spiritual and things temporal, he issued his famous bull *Unam Sanctam Ecclesiam.** In this bull he claims for himself and for his office absolute dominion over the lives and thoughts of men. He was nothing else than God on earth; whom he would he set up and whom he would he cast down. He commanded the two swords, the sword of the flesh as well as the sword of the spirit. The one he wielded directly; the other indirectly, the one by his own hand, the other by the hand of princes subject to his will.

Boniface and his immediate predecessors were all or nearly all that he claimed them to be. But the days of Cajetan were not as the days of Hildebrand, as Boniface found to his cost. Having published the bull *Unam Sanctam* the pope retired to Anagni that he might prepare and fulminate against the

*Henderson Doc. Middle Ages, pp. 434, 435.

King of France the last terrors of the Church; the excommunication, the interdict and the crusade.

News of these his hostile intentions reached France, and two of the king's partisans, Sciarra Colonna and William of Nogaret, without waiting for instructions from Philip, hurried over the Alps and down through Italy with three hundred horse at their back, and before the people of Anagni knew what was going on had taken the city and seized the person of the pope. Boniface did not quail before them. Dressed in his full pontificals, he received them with an angry dignity that became his office and his character. But his enemies hated the man too deeply to be awed by the pope. They treated him with great violence. Nogaret demanded a full release for the king from all censures of the Church, which, when the pope refused, it is said that Sciarra Colonna smote him in the face. For three days Anagni was given over to violence, and the pope was a prisoner in his own house. On the third day the people rose up and drove the invaders from the city and delivered the pope. Boniface went immediately to Rome; meditating vengeance, but only to die in a rage; and with him died forever the political and spiritual supremacy of the Bishop

of Rome. From that day to this the pope has been a disturbing, but never controlling, power in the political life of Europe. Little by little his dominion has been taken away, until he is nothing else than a private citizen of the kingdom of Italy, and his spiritual supremacy is denied and rejected by the most powerful and intelligent of his former subjects.

Ten days after the death of Boniface the frightened cardinals got together and elected Nicholas Boccasini, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, to the vacant see.

Nicholas assumed the name of Benedict XI., which was the Christian name of Boniface; the new pope thus declaring his purpose of sustaining the policy and avenging the wrongs of his predecessor.

All the princes wrote to congratulate the pope upon his promotion, none more cordially than Philip; and it seemed as if there might be peace between the pope and the king. The pope quietly retired from the advanced position of Boniface; he did not reaffirm the bull *Unam Sanctam,* and he did release Philip from the censure of the Church. But with this the king was not satisfied. He wanted not pardon but justification. To justify himself he must

condemn Boniface. If Cajetan were a good pope, exercising lawful authority, then Philip had been guilty of a great crime, he had outraged and slain the Lord's annointed.

Philip pressed the pope for the condemnation of Boniface.

Not only did the pope refuse this, but he proceeded to anathematize in the strongest language known to spiritual censure all who were in any way concerned in the affair of Anagni. This placed Philip again under condemnation, and another bitter war would have followed had Benedict lived. But this mild man was not equal to the task of reconstituting the papacy. It was too much for his physical strength. He died after a pontificate of eight months.

The first terror of Anagni having passed away, the cardinals gave free play to their political passions in the election of his successor. The college was equally divided between the French and Roman interest, and for ten months no election was possible. The student of papal history must remark with curiosity these vacancies in the papal office and wonder how the body survived so long without its head. After this delay an agreement was made by

the contending parties, looking to a close of the contest. It was decided that the Roman party should choose the names of three Churchmen from beyond the Alps, and for one of these the French party would vote and so put an end to the scandal of a prolonged vacancy.

Among the names chosen was that of Bernard de Goth, Archbishop of Bordeaux, a creature of Boniface, and a sworn enemy of Philip. But the Frenchmen knew their man. They sent a secret message, post haste to Philip, and Philip sent word to Bernard to meet him for a private interview in an abbey, in a wood near S. John De Angelli. Then Philip made known to the astonished archbishop that he had it in his power to make him pope. But before he could do this he must be assured of the loyalty and fidelity of the man who was now his subject, but who might upon promotion deem himself his master. The archbishop made every protestation of utter devotion to the person and interests of the king, and these two made a compact. Philip would use his interest and secure the election of Bernard, on condition: First, that Bernard, when pope, should release Philip from all censures which he had incurred in his dispute with Boniface;

second, that he should restore to his favor all who had in any way been concerned in the proceedings against that pope; third, that he should condemn the memory of Boniface; fourth, that he should restore the Colonna to their dignities, and promote to the college of cardinals such persons as the king should name; fifth, that he should give to the king a tenth of the revenues of the Church for five years. A sixth condition was kept secret to be demanded of the pope at the pleasure of the king. This agreement made, the king sent his messenger with all speed back to Rome, and upon his arrival Bernard de Goth, Archbishop of Bordeaux, was chosen pope, and so became the successor of S. Peter and the vicar of Christ on earth.

The new pope summoned the cardinals to cross the Alps and meet him in Lyons, where he was crowned, taking the name of Clement V. Clement made haste to carry out his contract with the king: he released Philip from all the censures of the Church; he granted him a tenth of the Church's revenue; he restored to papal favor all engaged in the outrages at Anagni, except Sciarra Colonna and William of Nogaret, upon whom he laid a slight penance; but he would not condemn the memory of

Boniface, and his whole pontificate was spent in a miserable struggle to avoid that fatal blow to the pretensions and power of the papacy.

To escape from the immediate jurisdiction of Philip, Clement transferred the papal residence from Lyons to Avignon. The poor priest had in his heart that love for France which is the strongest passion with every Frenchman, and he had also that love of ease and pleasure which is so natural to the Gascon. He could not bear to exile himself from France, still less could he bear the turbulence of Rome. So he chose for the spiritual capital of Christendom the softest and lovliest spot in the world.

Just outside the boundaries of France, in the country of Provence, which was under the rule of Charles of Naples, the pope found his Zoar, his little city of refuge. Avignon lay upon the left bank of the Rhone, in the midst of a large and fruitful plain. Except for the bitter winds that sometimes come to it, it was, and is, an earthly paradise; there the skies are clear and the air is soft. Like Israel's promised land, it was a land of oil and wine, a land flowing with milk and honey.

During the period of papal residence in Avignon,

the French influence was supreme. Himself a Frenchman, the pope lent himself easily to French interests. Clement, to his eternal shame, surrendered the Templars to the rapacity and cruelty of Philip the Fair. He did, indeed, avoid the last degradation, the condemnation of Boniface; but he escaped it only by the skin of his teeth. Philip, worn out and nigh unto death, dropped the persecution.

When Clement died, which he did after a reign of nearly nine years, there was an interregnum of more than two years. There was now no great question dividing the conclave: it was a mere matter of spoils that delayed the election. At last the cardinals were driven together in Carpentras, by the sword of Philip of Orleans, and compelled to a choice. They chose James of Cahors, Cardinal D'Eusa, Bishop of Porto. This man had vowed that if elected he would never mount horse until he set out for Rome; and he did not. After his coronation, when he took the name of John XXII., he walked from his house in Carpentras to the river, took a boat and sailed down to Avignon, walked from the shore to the palace, and never left it during the eighteen years of his pontificate.

At the death of John, the cardinals after long balloting chanced to throw their votes to James Fournier, the least conspicuous member of the college, and to his and their astonishment, elected him to the see of Peter. He took the name of Benedict XII., and during his episcopate of ten years, did all that he could to reform the Church. But the abuses were too much for one old man and he left the Church as he found it.

After him came Peter Roger, Clement VI., the Limousian noble, of whom it is written that he he was free with the company of women, a gentleman of wealth, of leisure and magnificence.

After Clement VI. came Stephen Aubert, Innocent VI., a good old man, who, in his reign of ten years, did what he could to curb the growing evils of the Church.

The absence of the popes from Rome was now a scandal that threatened the papacy itself. But the cardinals were native and to the manner born. Avignon was their home and they hated to think of a change. After the death of Innocent, the college elected William Grimoardi Abbot of the Monastery of S. Victor, in Marseilles. He had said he would die happy, could be but see the pope restored to

Rome. The cardinals did not know this when they elected him, else had he not been chosen.

And the new pope was as good as his word. Urban V., for so he called himself, did try to restore the residence of the popes to Rome. He was crowned at Avignon. But after a while, in the midst of weeping cardinals, he set out for Italy, sailing from Marseilles. He came to Corneto, from where he went to Viterbo, which he made his temporary residence, and where he received the submission of Rome. But the change was too much for the old man. Homesickness overcame him, and he returned to Avignon to die.

To his successor, Peter Roger, the younger Gregory XI., belongs the honor of the permanent restoration of the papacy to Rome.

Nephew of Clement VI., cardinal at eighteen, a close student, of severe life, he would not endure the looseness of the clergy. To an idle bishop in Avignon he said, "Why are you not in your diocese?" The pert answer was, "Why are you not in yours?" The answer smote him in the face, and he at once decided to go where he belonged, to sit in his seat, which was the seat of St. Peter and St.

Paul. Resisting the pressure that was brought upon him by the cardinals and the court of France, he went sadly back to desolated Rome. He, too, sickened of that turbulent city, and was ready to forsake it and return to Avignon, but death stepped in and prevented his desertion. He died in Rome in the 9th year of his pontificate, the 47th year of his age and in the 72d year of the captivity.

While Gregory was on his death-bed the banner-bearers of the city came to the cardinals and told them that it was the will of the people that they should elect a Roman or an Italian pope. The cardinals answered that such things were not spoken of out of conclave, and they would at the proper time choose a pope after their own conscience and for the good of the whole Church. The banner-bearers told them that their lives were in danger unless they complied with the wishes of the people. The cardinals again answered that an election under duress would be null and void, and one so chosen be an usurper and no true pope. When Gregory died, the magistrates came again seeking some assurance from the cardinals that they would elect a Roman to the Roman See. But the cardinals answered them

after the former manner; they would elect whom they would elect.

Then the magistrates determined to force an election; they guarded the gates of the city; expelled the nobles and all partisans of the cardinals; filled the streets with peasants and mechanics, who hooted the cardinals and followed them into the very conclave itself, crying "a Roman pope or death." All day the crowds surged about the place of the conclave, and all night a frightful cry went up of *Romano lo Volemo lo papa. Romano lo Volemo.* The banner-bearers sent word into the conclave that they could not restrain the people much longer; the cardinals must elect a Roman or Italian pope or die.

In their consternation the cardinals cast their eyes hastily upon Bartholomew Pignano, Archbishop of Bari, a man of ability, who was well learned in the canon law, and so would know the invalidity of his election. The cardinals did not know that Pignano was a secret instigator of the riot with a view to his own election. In fright and fear they gave their votes to him, and he was chosen pope. This fact was proclaimed from a window of the palace where

the conclave was assembled, and the people with a great shout ran to build fires and to ring bells.

The next day Pignano was enthroned and assumed the name of Urban VI. Knowing the irregularity of his election, he began at once to suspect the cardinals of an intention to declare that election illegal. So he watched them with suspicious closeness, and treated them with great rigor. He developed at once a most violent and tyrannical temper.

So long as they were in Rome the cardinals did not dare to question Urban's title. But twelve of them escaped to Anagni, and there made oath before the Chamberlain of the Holy See that the election of Urban was forced and not free. They communicated this fact to the cardinals which were at Avignon, and warned all Christendom of the illegality of the election.

They were joined by the cardinals at Avignon, and enticed away the only two cardinals who were true to Urban by promising secretly to elect each of them pope, and proceeded with great formality to declare the nullity of their former action and to call upon Urban to give up an office and a title which were not rightly his. Urban raged against them

like a wounded bear. He sent soldiers to take them and bring them in chains to Rome. The cardinals fled from Avignon to Fondi in the kingdom of Naples, and there they elected Robert of Geneva, one of their own number, to the papacy.

And so began the great schism, which lasted from the year 1378 to the year 1414. During all these six and thirty years there were two popes in western Christendom, each with his own obedience, each with his bitter partisans. The garment of the Church's unity was torn to shreds, and these contending priests were shaking the rags in each other's faces. With Urban went the better part of Italy, England, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Hungary and Bohemia. With Robert of Geneva, who took the name of Clement VII., went France and Savoy, Naples and afterwards Spain. After a short sojourn in Naples, Clement retired to Avignon.

The question of the rightful title to the papacy has not been settled to this day. Saints differed from saints and doctors from doctors. The Councils of Pisa and of Constance could not decide the perplexing question. Roman writers tell us that while it is necessary to salvation to believe that there is an infallible head of the Church on earth, it is

not necessary to know who that head is. So to this day we do not know which was the voice from heaven, the voice of Urban who condemned Clement, or the voice of Clement who condemned Urban.

As long as these two lived the war went on, and the papacy sank lower and lower in the estimation of mankind. Clement and Urban each promoted cardinals. So now it was pope against pope and college against college. With Urban there was no thought of compromise. His reign was one of violence, and it was wittily said that he should have called himself Turbanus instead of Urbanus. When Urban died men hoped for the healing of the schism. It was a scandal that was threatening the whole existing order. The popes were in such danger as they had never been before. The people were beginning to laugh at them, and a laugh is the end of all pretension. The danger of the pope was the danger of the hierarchy. So the priesthood took alarm and began to work for the peace of the Church.

The princes and the prelates besought the cardinals of Urban not to enter into a new election. But fearing for their cardinalate, they would not listen. First taking an oath that bound whosoever was

elected to resign as soon as the pope at Avignon should resign, they chose Peter Thomacelli, Boniface IX., in the room of Urban; this process was repeated upon the election of Innocent VII., and again swearing on holy Gospel, they chose Angelus Corarius, who assumed the name of Gregory XII.

In Avignon, where Clement died, his cardinals taking the same oath and making the same protestations, as if to bring the papacy into utter contempt, proceeded to elect the impossible Peter De Luna to the vacant see, who called himself Benedict XIII. Christendom now saw two old men, each claiming to be vicar of Christ on earth; each excommunicating the other, and the sight was not edifying.

Churchmen in every part of the Catholic world began to bestir themselves. The University of Paris under the lead of Peter d'Ailly and John Gerson called for a council to reform the Church and its head and members. All Europe responded to the call. Every effort was made to have both popes resign as the easiest way of ending the schism. They both swore that this was the very thing they wanted to, but they backed and filled and did nothing.

At last the patience of their very partisans was

worn out. France withdrew from the obedience of Benedict and the king made him a prisoner in his palace. He excommunicated the king and all the king's men and escaped into Spain.

The majority of his cardinals forsook him, and joining with a majority of the cardinals of Gregory called a council to end the schism. This council met in Pisa, in the year 1409. It was largely attended by prelates of every degree. It summoned both claimants to the papacy to appear for judgment, that the council might decide between them. On their failing to do so, the council excommunicated and degraded both Benedict and Gregory, and commanded the cardinals to elect a new pope. This they did, choosing Peter Candia, a mild Muscovite friar, of feeble health and great age, who took the name of Alexander V. After his election the council dispersed and the schism was not healed. Spain was still true to Benedict and parts of Italy to Gregory. So the Council of Pisa did nothing but make matters worse. After it, there were three popes instead of two.

And now comes upon the stage a character who sums up in himself all the wretchedness of this wretched period. At the Council of Pisa none was

more busy, none made himself more agreeable than Balthazar Cossa, Cardinal Legate of Bologna. He looked after everybody's welfare; arranged for all meetings and brought about the election of good old Peter Candia. And he was chief adviser to Alexander during his pontificate. For his advantage, Alexander died in ten months and eight days from the day of his coronation. Then Cardinal Cossa, being in his own city of Bologna, terrorized the cardinals and compelled his own election. He assumed the name of John XXIII., the most infamous name in the long line of popes.

The Council of Pisa had directed that another council should assemble in three years, to take up the work of reforming the Church in its head and members. The continuance of the schism and the character of John made that council an imperative necessity.

The Emperor Sigismund demanded of John that he should summon the council. After long hesitation the pope consented, on the condition that the council should be called in his name and acknowledge his title. The emperor insisted on joining his name to that of the pope and having the choice of the place of meeting. To these terms the pope at last agreed, and a decree went forth calling a coun-

cil to meet in the city of Constance, in the fall of 1414. Meantime the mind of the Church was prepared for radical action. Gerson wrote pamphlet after pamphlet, asserting the right of a council to judge and depose a pope. He stood on old Catholic ground. The Church was the head of the pope, not the pope the head of the Church. He was servant not master.

And now the city of Constance was the center of interest to Christendom. The little town was all astir. Servants of the great prelates and princes came to make ready for their masters, every inn was occupied and every house was an inn. And after the servants came the masters, the emperor and the princes, the pope and the cardinals, the archbishops, bishops, and priests, and a host of doctors and divines. It was the largest and most dignified council that had met in the Church for centuries.

The great assembly was opened with all splendor and solemnity by the pope, but his heart misgave him as he looked over the vast gathering. He knew that he was in the power of the council, and the council was there to judge him.

To protect itself from being overborne by a host of Italian prelates in the interest of the pope, the council decided to vote by nations—Italy, France, Germany and England, and afterward Spain, each having one vote, and so once more nationalism triumphed over universalism, and the national churches of the next century cast their shadows before. The first business of the council was the healing of the schism. John XXIII. was pope in possession, should the council judge his claim. The council did not judge his claim; but it did judge his character, and condemn him as unfit to reign.

Nearly one hundred charges were brought against him. Into many of these, such as incest, rape and murder, the council refused to enter, as their discussion would but scandalize the more an already scandalized Christendom. The council decided to judge him on the ecclesiastical charges of heresy and simony. Every effort was made to compel the pope to cede the papacy.

This the pope at first consented to do. But he repented of his good resolution, escaped in the disguise of a groom to Schaffhausen, a stronghold of his friend Duke Albert of Austria, and from there he dissolved the council. But the council stood firm.

It made its great declaration of rights in these memorable words: *"That the present council, lawfully assembled in the city of Constance, and representing the whole Church Militant, holds its power immediately from Jesus Christ, and all persons, of whatever state or dignity (the papal not excepted), are bound to obey it, in what concerns the faith, the extirpation of the schism and the reformation of the Church in its head and members."* It went on with the trial of the pope, and condemned and deposed him.

Albert of Austria surrendered him to Sigismund, and Sigismund gave him up to the council. He was thrown into a dungeon; his spirit broken; he submitted to the council; he confessed his crimes; he ceded the papacy. And so ended in shame the shameful schism.

Gregory XII., by two of his cardinals, ceded his right to the papacy for a cardinal's hat.

The emperor went a long journey into Spain to procure like action from Benedict; but he could do nothing with that old termagant; pope he was, and pope he would be. The emperor left him in Pensicola with his two cardinals—one to hold his candle and the other to hold his book, while he him-

self rang the bell and cursed the council and all the adherents of the council: he cursed Balthazar Cossa and Angelus Corarius; he cursed the emperor and the empire; he cursed the king of France and all the French people; he cursed England's king and England's folk, Castile, Aragon and the whole peninsula and all the islands of the sea. And then, in one comprehensive swoop, he cursed the whole world except himself and the two cardinals of his obedience, and he remained in that attitude of cursing until the day of his death.

But if Sigismund did not bring the cession of Benedict, he brought something of greater value to the council: he brought the accession of Spain. Representatives of the various Spanish kingdoms came with the emperor, and in public assembly renounced the obedience of Benedict and gave their consent to the acts of the Council of Constance. This made the council supreme in Western Christendom. It proceeded at once to anathematize and depose Peter De Luna, calling himself Benedict XIII. It left him to wither in the heat of his own curses in his own little town of Perpignan, while it declared the papacy vacant. The polity of the Church had now undergone a complete revolution:

a revolution as complete as that of the French government, when, on the 10th of August, 1792, the Constituent Assembly deposed Louis XVI. and declared the throne vacant. That the revolution in ecclesiastical polity was not permanent was owing entirely to the weakness of the Council of Constance. That council was called for the defence of the Faith, for the extirpation of the schism, and for the reformation of the Church in its head and members. It accomplished only one of these purposes: it did heal the schism—after Constance there are no more antipopes—but it did not reform the Church either in its head or members.

It did indeed reform the head of the Church for a moment by the simple and summary process of cutting off one head and putting on another; but it left the great body of abuses just as it found them. The Emperor Sigismund besought the council to proceed with the reformation of the Church before the election of a pope. But to this the council would not listen. It was an assembly of ecclesiastics eager for place and power. Every cardinal aspired to be pope. Every bishop hoped to be a cardinal; every priest a bishop. The one thought in everybody's mind was, Who will be the new pope?

The impatience of this thought hurried the council on to an election. The council, however, would not trust the election to the cardinals. It created a special electoral body. To the college of cardinals were joined thirty representatives from the council: six from each of the five nations. It was supposed that conflicting interests would make the contest a tedious one, but to the astonishment of all the conclave elected almost at once Otto, Cardinal Colonna, to the papal see. The election was received with joy by the whole council and city. The new pope was a prince of the Roman city as well as of the Roman Church; he was a man of irreproachable morals and of considerable learning. He was crowned in Constance in the midst of the rejoicing of the people. He assumed the name of Martin V., and in him was hailed the beginning of a new era. And it was a new era. The great mediæval papacy was gone, never to come back again.* With Martin V. begins the purely Italian papacy. He was the beginning of a line of popes which ended with the pontificate of Leo X. These popes were Italian princes whose sole end and purpose was not to rule the Church, but to enrich their own families and to

*Milman, Latin Christ, bk. 13, chaps. VIII., XX. M.

beautify their own city of Rome. This line of popes contains one or two names of repute: the lovely name of Thomas of Zarzanna, Nicholas V., creator of the papal city, so dear to the tourist; and the gentle name of Æneas Silvius Piccolomini, Pius II., last preacher of crusades. But the papacy declined with frightful rapidity from Martin V., until it became the prey of the licentious and rapacious Rodrigo Borgia, Alexander VI., and the plaything of Giovanni de Medici, Leo X.

And for this decline the Council of Constance was to blame. Never did an assembly of men fail so miserably in the main purpose that called them together. They took from the papacy all that made it great, and left it all that made it mean and miserable. Much of its power was gone, but all its stealings were left it. The pope was turned loose, not to rule the world any more, but to batten on its riches.

Soon after his coronation, Martin V. dropped down to Rome, and with him went the life of the council. It dragged its weary way along for a while, and then dispersed, leaving the Church in the main as it found it—unreformed in its head,

unreformed in its members—left it to await the wrath of God in the storms of the sixteenth century.

But the Council of Constance did something. It did for Western Christendom what the parliament of 1688 did for England; as that killed forever the absolute and divine right of kings, so this council put an end forever to the absolute and divine right of popes. Since 1414 the power of popes and priests has been passing into the hands of the people, so that it can now be truly said of them, as of the present sovereign of England, that they reign but do not rule. The pope still fills a vast place in Christendom, but it is not the place of Hildebrand, or even of Cajetan. Men no longer fear his interdict nor his excommunication. The excommunicated Döllinger was buried in honor, with the Archbishop of Munich standing by and baring his head in reverence before the open grave. The reign of the popes may continue for ages, but the rule of the popes is over.

The Rise of the National Churches.

In the year 1517 Frederick, Elector of Saxony, was filled with shame and indignation as he saw his people flocking to buy indulgences of one Tetzel, the agent of Albert, the Archbishop of Mainz and Magdeburg, who in turn was the agent of Pope Leo X. Albert, himself, an elector of the Empire, and a brother of the Elector of Brandenburg, had contracted to pay 30,000 gulden into the papal treasury as the price of his Archbishopric. This prelate, a young voluptuary of extravagant habits, had no intention of paying the 30,000 gulden out of his own purse. This sum of money must in some way be filched from the people. There was in those days a method of robbery which was both safe and sacred; it was robbery authorized by the state and blessed by the church. The robbers were Popes and Archbishops, who, by threats and persuasion, caused the people to exchange their gold and their silver, the wages of their toil, for pieces of paper called indulgences. These indulgences had

no value whatever in this world, but they were supposed to be cashed in the world to come. A man, having purchased this indulgence, might dismiss the thought of his sin from his mind. He had condoned for his guilt by money payment, and he was promised a speedy deliverance from the pains of purgatory. The traffic in indulgences was based upon the superstitious fears of men, and was an unfailing source of revenue to the church.

The anger of the Elector of Saxony was kindled against this practice because he saw it was enriching his rival, the Archbishop of Mainz. It was his people who were paying the price of the Archbishopric into the coffers of the Pope. But, fret and fume as he might, the Elector Frederick saw no means of redress. He could not appeal to the Emperor, because the Empire was without a head, and the vacant throne was the prize, for which three Kings of Europe were contending,—each of whom was anxious for the favor of the Pope and the vote of the Archbishop of Mainz. If the Elector had appealed to Rome, the Pope and the Cardinals would have laughed in his face, for it was the Pope who furnished the indulgences which Tetzel had for sale. For the Elector of Saxony there was no re-

lief, and he had to stand by and bite his nails as he saw the good money of his people flowing a steady stream of gold and silver into the pockets of his hated rival.*

Just when matters were at their worst relief came from an unexpected quarter. Frederick, who was a lover of learning, had founded a university in his city of Wittenberg. In that university was a young Augustinian monk, who was renowned as a scholar and a saint. This monk, the son of a miner of Eisleben, was a man of the people, who all his life long had stood in the presence of God, and in that presence had learned the true value of indulgences, as of all other priestly wares which were sold to the people. He pronounced the indulgences worthless because they had not the Divine indorsement. And this monk, having the courage of his convictions, proclaimed the fraudulent character of the papal wares to all the world. No sooner had the Wittenberg professor spoken out than he found an immediate response in the hearts of all the people. The word of Luther not only hindered the

*L. Ranke, History of Reformation in Germany, bk. 2, chap. VII.

sale of indulgences in Saxony, and so saved the money of the Elector, but it released forces that brought about the destruction of the whole ecclesiastical system of which the sale of indulgences was a part. Beginning with a denial of the right of the Pope to authorize the sale of indulgences, the German reformer went on by logical necessity to deny to the Pope any right at all over the heart and mind of man. God in Christ was the only power to whom the conscience of man owed allegiance, and God's mind and will were expressed in the Holy Scriptures. The movement which Luther inaugurated was not so much a reformation as it was a revolution, and a revolution far more radical than the reformer himself had any notion of bringing about. Luther was a churchman and a schoolman, and what he desired was a reformation of the church and an enlightenment of the school. What he really did was to deliver man from bondage both to church and school, and set him free to work out his own intellectual and spiritual salvation with fear and trembling.

Luther, in making his appeal to scripture simply substituted authority for authority,—the authority of the written tradition for the authority of the oral

tradition of the church. He made the Apostolic age the infallible rule of truth.

This position of Luther was without any basis in pure reason. If we can ascribe infallibility to the first age of Christianity, then we can with equal justice predicate infallibility of all ages. But, while the position of Luther was untenable in the light of pure reason, it was impregnable as against his adversaries at the time. The church proclaimed the Old and New Testament Scriptures to be the Word of God, and to the judgment of that Word the church was bound to submit its actions and its claims.

Because the life of humanity is progressive, therefore it is that mankind advances step by step. It was not possible for the reformers of the sixteenth century to see the full consequences of their own contention, and to grant to men at once that perfect freedom of thought, and that comparative freedom of action, which after four centuries we see to be the natural outcome of their teaching. The first result of the action of Luther was not to produce a higher order, but to bring about a greater confusion. When that strong man, the Papacy, was bound,

then the whole world flocked about him to spoil his goods, and the lion's share of the spoil was appropriated by the Kings and princes. As after the fall the Pope there was no earthly divinity from which kings could derive their title, they claimed to have it direct from God. It is in the centuries immediately succeeding the Reformation that we hear of the divine right of Kings, and in which Europe falls a prey to that system of absolute monarchy which ended in the horrors of the French Revolution.

Luther was a powerful factor, both in casting down the Papacy, and in setting up the Kings. In fighting the Pope, the reformer was fighting the battle of the Kings. Because of the Reformation, religion was in a manner localized and nationalized. Each ruler became the head of a religion within his own dominions. No one at the Reformation period dreamed of permitting the people to think and choose for themselves. Luther, who exercised the right of private judgment himself, refused that right to all others. By virtue of his genius and of his political alliance with the princes of North Germany he aspired, himself, to the office of infallible teacher of mankind. He thundered against the

Swiss reformer, Zwingli, with the same violence that he thundered against the Pope. Luther was not the champion of free thought; he was, as I have said, the champion of the written as against the oral tradition of Christianity, of the local, against the universal, church.

The immediate result of the Reformation was the establishment of the national churches of northern Europe, in which the Kings and the theological faculties were the Popes and the Cardinals. It was expected that the people at large would meekly follow their rulers in every change of religion. The Protestant Reformation was not so much the work of the preachers as it was the work of the princes. It was the German princes who entered their solemn protest against the action of the Diet of Speyer and thus gave name to the new religion that had entered the world. And at the Diet of Augsburg, in 1555, it was decided by way of compromise that the head of each separate state of Germany be permitted to adopt either the Catholic or the Protestant creed and that the subjects of each state must conform to the religion of the ruler. This decision not

only divided Germany into Protestant and Catholic, but it made the head of the state also the head of the church. Even in Catholic countries it was Catholicism, and not Papacy, which survived the Reformation. The power of the popes was everywhere subject to the power of kings. The days of excommunication and interdict were over, and the spiritual was everywhere, except in the states of the church, subject to the temporal authority.

The division of Europe into Protestant and Catholic countries gave rise in the sixteenth century to the religious wars which wasted western Christendom for a hundred years. Freedom of thought was not dreamed of, and prosecution for opinion's sake was considered the bounden duty of princes. Not only did Catholics persecute Protestants, and Protestants, Catholics, but Protestants raged against Protestants, and put them to death. Luther rejoiced when Zwingli was killed in battle, and Calvin burned Servetus in the market place of Geneva. It was this division of Protestantism against itself that arrested the progress of the movement, lost France to the Reformation, and brought about the Catholic reaction.

When we calmly consider the history of the

Reformation we see that it was not the people at large who profited by that movement, but it was in the main the upper classes, the princes and the nobility, who reaped the benefit. The princes succeeded to the power of the Pope, and the nobility to the wealth of the clergy. After his condemnation by the Pope Luther made his appeal, not to the people at large, but to the Christian nobility of the German Empire, and he professed to place his faith in the newly elected Emperor and in the princes of the Empire. In the peasants' war Luther was strongly on the side of the rulers as against the people, and to this day the national establishments which are the product of the Reformation movement are the churches of the so called higher classes; the churches in which the rulers, political and mercantile, of the Protestant world find themselves at home.

This relation of church and state, which followed upon the preaching of Luther, had its most perfect example in England. There was in England at the time no spiritual genius like Luther, or Zwingli, or Calvin, but there was a King of indomitable will and unscrupulous ambition, who took advantage of the religious ferment to establish his absolute authority

over both church and state. When Henry determined to cast off the authority of the see of Rome, he found his willing instruments among the higher dignitaries of the church. The Bishops and the Deans and the heads of colleges were for the most part ready to follow the King in his work of revolution. The people on the whole were passive. The English people had not the same reason to hate the Roman see which moved the people of Germany; and would have been satisfied with a reasonable redress of grievances and a reform of the more flagrant abuses. That England is to-day the most Protestant of nations, is owing not to the preaching of Luther, but to the influence of Calvin, and more especially to the blunders of the see of Rome. Henry was not a follower of Luther. He earned his title of Defender of the Faith by writing a treatise against the heresies of the German agitator. Henry remained in all essentials a Catholic to the day of his death. His quarrel was not with the church, but with the Pope. Had the Pope yielded in the matter of the divorce of Catherine, the King might have remained all his life a faithful son of the church, and the Reformation in England had a different history. But the Pope could not, and the

King would not, yield. So Henry, by an act of royal power, separated the Church of England from the communion of the Church of Rome. This act of the King saved the Church of England from that loss of historical continuity which was the great misfortune of the reformed churches on the continent. The ancient liturgies of the church were preserved intact, and were translated into English, and in the prayer book of the English Church have become the priceless heritage of the English people. The ancient ministry of Christendom in its threefold form of bishops, priests, and deacons, was left in possession of the offices of the church, and, more important than all, the buildings themselves, the cathedrals and the parish churches, were, under the King as under the Pope, the houses of prayer and praise for the English people. Whether this preservation of the liturgy, the ministry, and the churches in England was good or evil will depend upon the value which we give to historical continuity. If we prize things that are ancient; if we believe that the evolutionary process is better than the revolutionary,—then we will look upon the reformation in England, despite the crimes of its authors, as being upon the whole beneficial to the spiritual interests

of mankind. But that it was an unmixed good will be maintained by no one, except by such as see in themselves and in the ecclesiastical body to which they belong, the last and final work of God.

The English church was at the reformation, localized and nationalized, as was no other church in western Christendom. The great Catholic churches of France, Spain, Italy, and Austria had free communion among themselves, and so had the Protestant churches of North Germany, Switzerland, and Scandinavia; but the English church was isolated from all Christendom by her denial of the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome on the one hand and her refusal to admit the validity of the ministry of the Protestant churches on the other; and in this position of proud isolation the Church of England has remained to this present. She is the most purely national of all the churches.

Henry, with a brutality that marked all his actions, subjected the spiritual to the temporal power. The King, by royal decree and act of Parliament, became supreme head of the Church in England. He appointed her officers and prescribed her doctrine. He burned men at the stake, or beheaded them, on Tower Hill, if they refused to ac-

cept the royal supremacy, or presumed to reject the dogma of the real presence of the Eucharist. The flower of English manhood and womanhood, in the persons of Sir Thomas More and Ann Askew, perished by ax and fire, the one because his Catholic and the other because her Puritan principles did not follow the exact line laid down by this supreme head of the English church. When Henry died the head of the English church was a precocious boy of sixteen. The brief life of Edward VI. was the critical period of the Church of England. A Protestant by conviction, he carried the church far enough along the way of reform to save the old establishment from destruction. The movement of the English people toward Protestantism was not arrested, it was accelerated, by the brief, violent, and ill-advised reign of Mary, the Catholic. The fires of Smithfield did more to make the people of England Protestant than the preaching of Latimer and Ridley. When Mary died the religious fate of England was settled for all time. England then took her place among the Protestant nations, if not among the Protestant churches; and there she has remained until this present day.

I think the fair-minded student of history will say

that the greatest evil connected with the reformation in England was the suppression of the monasteries and the distribution of their properties among the favorites of the court. No matter how corrupt these institutions might be, there was no excuse for the wholesale robbery which followed their dissolution. The property of the monasteries did not belong to the King or the courtiers; it was property held in trust for pious and charitable uses, for the benefit, not of a class, but of the whole people of England, and England paid the penalty of this gross injustice by the pauperizing of a large portion of her population.

It was Queen Elizabeth who gave to the Church of England that constitution of compromise and comprehension which has made this church exceptional among the churches of Christendom. Queen Elizabeth was a Catholic at heart, and would have been content to acknowledge the Pope as the spiritual head of the church if she could have done so with safety to her throne and her life. She was forced by the logic of her position into the championship of European Protestantism. But it was her wish to retain within the national establishment men of the old, as well as of the new faith. She

preserved the Catholic creeds and the Catholic offices of worship. She made bishops and archbishops to fill the ancient sees. She retained the ornaments of the church as they had been in the reign of Edward. She organized the church so that there would be room in it for all her subjects, except the extreme Catholic and the extreme Puritan, and for these she wished to have no place either in her church or in her Kingdom. This handiwork of Elizabeth has stood the test of time. It was threatened with destruction by the extreme Catholic in the days of Elizabeth herself and in the days of King James II. It was temporarily overthrown by the extreme Puritan in the time of Cromwell. But it has survived all disasters, and seems to-day secure in the affection of the majority of the English people.

Its relation to the state is the relation of subjection. The Crown now acts through the Prime Minister who represents the people. The Crown appoints the Bishops of the church, and the Parliament makes its laws. That such a situation is endurable is owing to the character of the English people and to the peculiar constitution of both church and state. The English are

at once the most progressive and most conservative of people. The most progressive when it is a matter of principle; the most conservative when it is a matter of form. The English church will freely allow every clergyman to deny the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian creed in his sermon, but will compel him to say them in the service. Canon Henson, the radical, and Canon Newboldt, the ritualist, are equally devoted to the liturgical worship of the church. It is the strength of the Church of England that men of widely different opinions are of one mind in worship and in work.

It is the weakness of this establishment that its higher officials are more apt to reflect the mind of the powers that be, than they are to reflect the mind of Christ. The ecclesiastic rises in his calling from a town or country curacy to the Episcopal throne through the favor of the civil power. He must, in order to succeed, combine the qualities of the saint with the character of the courtier; he must at the same time be able to please God and the King; and of the two it is more necessary to his worldly promotion that he please the King. England has produced the finest examples of these courtier-prelates, —men who were both pious and politic. Such men

make excellent officials, but are not great leaders. Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, said that the English church was rebuked daily by the 46th verse of the 119th Psalm, which reads: "I will speak of thy testimonies also, even before Kings, and will not be ashamed." It is the constant temptation of the King-made bishop to attune his message to the Kingly ear. When the King is to be rebuked you must not ask that task of the courtier prelate, but must call in some rough, rude man of the people, some man like Elijah the Tishbite, or John the Baptist, or Jesus of Nazareth.

Because of this tendency to subserviency the established churches have long since ceased to be the conscience keepers of the people of Europe. The nonconformist bodies in England are a protest against the too great conformity of the English establishment, to the world of royalty and nobility.

This evil of excessive conformity is constitutional with all state establishments. When the church is the mouthpiece of the state it can only speak the words which the state puts in its mouth. When the state approves of slavery the clergy of the state church will have no difficulty in finding that slavery is a divine institution; if the state is militant the

priesthood will bless the banners, and pray for the victory of the national arms. The state church of Russia is a perfect example of the complete subservience of an established church to the government which sustains it. It has always been so, and as long as human nature is human nature it always will be so. The hope of Russia is not in the Archbishop of Moscow, but in priests like Agathon, and in prophets like Tolstoy and Kropatkin; and what is true of the Russian church is true of all churches. The English church owes whatever greatness it may have to-day, not to its long line of archbishops, but to preachers like Wickliff and Wesley; to such parish priests and poets as George Herbert and John Keble; to such earnest souls as Simeon the Evangelical, and Newman the Catholic. High office and high character are seldom found together in this world, for too commonly high character is the price of high office.

Another evil which is the outcome of the civil establishment of religion is the false estimate which is put upon, not only official position, but upon the accidents of official life. Its salaries, its clothing, its palaces, are considered as marks of divine grace and favor, and as a necessary means of holding the

world in awe. Men are judged by these outward accidents of their career, rather than by their intrinsic character. In our modern capitalistic churches clergymen are rated as $3,000, $5,000, or $10,000 men. The successful clergyman, the man whose pictures are in the church papers, is the man who goes from the $3,000 to the $5,000, and from the $5,000, to the $10,000 church. It is the belief of many in England that, if the bishops were to lose their palaces, they would lose their power. Sometimes they have a bishop, like the present Bishop of London, who does not care to live in a palace, but the church says to him: You must live in a palace, because in the nature of things, bishops and palaces always go together. There is grim humor in the financial statement recently put forth by this same Bishop of London. His income is $30,000 a year. It takes it all to keep up his two palaces, and the poor man is in danger of being bankrupt.

I fear that the visit of the Archbishop to this country will have a tendency to promote this confusion of values in the mind of the American Episcopal church. This conception of the Episcopal office as depending for its efficacy upon the earthly accidents that attach to it is already rife among us.

In the opinion of many of the leading members of our communion the dignity of the Episcopal office depends upon the extent of territory over which the bishop presides, and upon the wealth of the church as expressed in property and contributions. The American, and indeed the modern, is prone to confound greatness with bigness. Measured by this standard the life of Jesus was most insignificant, the country through which He preached was no larger than Monroe and Ontario counties combined, and the town that he made his home not so large as Canandaigua.

It will be a blessed day for Christianity when this materialistic conception of greatness perishes from out the thought of the Christian world; when it will be allowable for the Bishop of Rome to leave his palace of many thousand rooms, to disband his guards, and disperse his retinue, and live as Peter lived in the humble quarter of the Trastevere under the Janiculum. The cause of the Gospel will not be hindered when a man like the Bishop of London can dispense with mansions of state and live as Paul lived, in his own hired house; the ministry will not be depressed; it will be exalted,—when men are valued for their *salt* more than for their salary.

The established churches of the world are everywhere in decay, and must soon pass away, and their disappearance will not be an unmixed evil if with them goes that worldliness, which more even than grosser sin is the enemy of the religion of Jesus.

Relation of Church and State in the United States.

In the year 1620 a little ship of 180 tons' burden was beating up against the wind along the shore of Cape Cod in the Bay of Massachusetts. Exclusive of the crew, this ship had on board just 100 souls. From a human point of view there could be nothing more insignificant, nothing more forlorn, than this weather-beaten vessel with its storm-tossed passengers on the desolate coast of what was then the unbroken wilderness of New England. But, looked at in the light of after events, we see in this ship a new ark of salvation for mankind. To parallel this event, we must go back to the days when the ark landed the patriarch Noah and his sons on the Mountain of Ararat, or to the days when Abram heard in Ur of the Chaldees the voice of God saying unto him: Get thee out from thy country and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee of.* Or, if these stories of Noah and Abram seem to us legendary

*Gen. XII.: 1.

and without basis in fact, then to find an event of greater importance than the beating of the Mayflower into the Bay of Massachusetts we must go back to the day when a little band of men and women gathered together in an upper chamber in Jerusalem to wait for the promise of the Lord.

The men and women in that ship had in their keeping the future history of the world. They were destined to shape the policy and inspire the heart of a new people; to create a nation in which church and state were at last to be absolutely one. In which the principles of human government as these principles were expounded by Jesus of Nazareth were to be the foundation stones of a great national polity.

Four months before they sighted Cape Cod these people had sailed out of the port of Plymouth in the south of England for the purpose of seeking a new home in a strange land. They were driven to this enterprise by the desire to find a place where they might worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. They were men and women who were unable to conform to the religious life of the country of their nativity. As we have already heard, the state religion, as established by

the Elizabethan settlement, was a compromise intended to include all but the extreme Catholic and the extreme Puritan. For a while this effort to comprehend the whole nation in the ecclesiastical establishment was successful; but in the nature of things this state of absolute equilibrium could not last long. If the people of England had been without reason or conscience they might have followed the Kings and Queens of England in every vagary of religion, and rested content in the religious life which was marked out for them by the royal will. But, being men of thought and feeling and sturdy independence, the Islanders were certain sooner or later to rebel against the authority that sought to regulate their consciences, and to curb the exercise of their reason and their will. When the Pope excommunicated Queen Elizabeth the extreme Catholics renounced their membership in the Church of England.* When James I., in 1607, uttered his famous tirade against the Puritans, who sought relief from some of the forms of the church, saying with royal spleen: I will make them conform, or I will harry them out of the land, then the Puritan saw it was time for him to escape from bondage, and

*Making of New England, John Fiske, chap. II.

he separated himself from the church of his fathers. The leader of this band was William Brewster, of the town of Scrooby, in Nottinghamshire. Before Brewster, men called fanatics had refused to conform to the doctrine and discipline of the established church; but these, like all forerunners, had to go each his own way, and left no permanent result behind them. William Brewster was a Puritan who hoped to reform the church from within, and he remained in the church until the action of James made the church too narrow to contain men of his type. He gathered together a company of men and women who met on Sunday for divine service in his own drawing room at Scrooby Manor. The pastor of this congregation, for congregation it had become, was John Robinson, a native of Lincolnshire. This man had no ordination other than that which came to him from God and from the choice of his fellowmen. He was learned, gentle, pious, and, for his age, tolerant, and, out of the abundance that God had given him, he ministered to the people. Among those who gathered together every Lord's Day in the drawing room of Scrooby Manor was William Bradford, a lad of seventeen, already remarkable

for his intelligence, his piety, and his weight of character. He was destined to take a leading part in the stirring events to come. The meetings of this little congregation could not go on unmolested. Already the Stuarts were preparing for their doom by seeking to drive their subjects into their own way of thinking and believing. The wrath of the King was hot against such men as Brewster, Robinson, and Bradford. And these followers of Jesus, remembering the words of the Lord, "When they persecute you in one city, flee ye unto another,*— sought safety from the anger of James by flight into Holland. Under the guidance of Robinson, they made a settlement in Leyden, where a residence of eleven years welded them into a compact organic body.

But these men were not only Christians; they were also Englishmen; and they desired their children to be born Englishmen, and to live under English law. In the course of the centuries England had developed an institution that reconciled law and liberty. This institution was representative government. The ancient democracies had failed to secure both law and liberty because they knew of no way for the people

*St. Matthew, x.: 23.

to act except in the mass; and the mass is at last the mob, and the mob is the natural prey of the leader. The imperial system was the necessary outcome of the effort to extend the democratic rule of Rome over Europe. The only way that Rome could rule was by having the central government send agents out to rule the people. This is imperialism pure and simple, as we see it in the Empire of Russia and in the Roman Catholic church to-day, and it was the system that prevailed all over the continent of Europe until the nineteenth century. But in England another system of government was devised. Instead of the central government, sending agents to rule the people, the people sent agents to rule the central government. The English people kept in their own hands that power of the purse without which no government can exist. "No taxation without representation," is the watchword of English civilization, and marks the difference between modern and ancient democracy.

The English exiles at Leyden craved the possession and exercise of their political, as well as of their religious, rights and duties; indeed, with them their religious included their political rights. Moved by these considerations the Pilgrims secured

a charter and set sail for the new world. Before landing on the shores of their future country these men had made for themselves a written Constitution, had chosen governor and councillors, and had organized both a church and a state. In this organization the spiritual power was supreme and the state was a function of the church.

This settlement of the congregation of Leyden at Plymouth attracted to that region the thought of the Puritan element in England, which was growing more and more restless and refractory under the limitations of the English establishment. In the early years of Charles I. a large company of Puritans determined to migrate and establish a Puritan church and state in the land which God had provided for them. These men followed in the wake of the Pilgrims of Leyden and settled upon the shores of Massachusetts bay. Before leaving England this new band of Puritans elected John Winthrop as their governor, and, like the men of Leyden, migrated, not as individuals, but as an organized state. They were perfectly conscious of what they were doing and of the far-reaching significance of their action. They believed that God was calling them to lay the foundations of a new and great

Kingdom—a Kingdom in which God should be the absolute ruler and His word the only law. The ideal of the Puritan was a Mosaic theocracy adapted to the form and principles of English constitutional law. This union of religious enthusiasm with the forms of practical government gave stability to the Puritan state, and is the secret of Puritan domination in America.

It was not the purpose of these founders of the Puritan commonwealth to grant either liberty of thought or liberty of action. Their conception of the church and of the state forbade their entertaining the notion of what we call religious liberty. In their estimation it was treason to doubt the plenary inspiration of the Bible, or to question the doctrines of the church. They endeavored to secure the absolute identity of church and state by limiting political privileges to the members of the church. We cannot in this lecture enter minutely into the history of this Puritan state-church. It is easy to speak scoffingly of the bigotry and narrowness of the Puritan, to tell lurid stories of the whipping of heretics, the hanging of women, and the burning of witches; but it is not so easy to measure the moral value and the spiritual potency of that conception

of the state which looks upon it as the instrument of divine justice; which teaches that officers of the state are the vicegerents of God. Such a conception is the only one that can make the state other than a merciless machine. If the state is not divine it is brutal.

And when to this conception you join that other pregnant doctrine of which the Puritan was the exponent, which declares the sacredness and the right of the common man; when you make every man's destiny an expression of the eternal will of God,—then you have a foundation for government which cannot be shaken. Every man in the Puritan conception is a church-state in himself. In the man the spiritual power must be supreme. Conscience, not interest, must be the guide of life. Each man is a divinely inspired, divinely guided, political and spiritual power, and the state is simply a federation of these political and spiritual units in a general government. Each man is to have his voice heard and his vote counted in the consideration and determination of the affairs of state. This union of Teutonism and Hebraism; this marriage of Mosaic theocracy to English democracy, is the contribution of English Puritanism to the political life of the

world, and the modern state is the offspring of this union. It does not matter that the Puritan church-state as the Puritan conceived it did not outlast the lives of the first generation. That was a foregone conclusion. In the very nature of things a government based upon the Calvinistic interpretation of Holy Scripture must be short-lived. But, while the Puritan church-state failed as an institution, it endured as an idea. The Puritan influence dominated all other influences in American life from the landing of the Pilgrims down to the close of the Civil War. The south contributed to the American commonwealth administrative ability; the middle Atlantic states were the seat of commercial activity and kindly philanthropy, but Puritan New England was the breeding place of spiritual enthusiasm and high moral purpose. It was the belief of the Puritan that was the motive power of the American Revolution. It was the stern conviction of the Puritan that not King George, but God, was the rightful sovereign in America, not the Parliament of England, but the people of the united Colonies, were the sole keepers of the purse and the only source of political power; and it was this conviction of the Puritan that sustained the people of the country through the long years of the Revolutionary War.

It is curious to remark how, up to the days of the Civil War, and in a measure beyond that period, each section of English North America reflected the character of the first settlers. The south was colonized by adventurous sons of the nobility and gentry of England, who came to secure for themselves estates in the new land which were denied them in the old. These men lived, not in towns, but on plantations; each man was a sovereign lord in his own domain, having servants and slaves under him. This potentate kept his chaplain to look after his spiritual affairs, as he kept his overseer to look after his temporal affairs; but he himself looked sharply after both chaplain and overseer. He believed in church and state, with the church in dutiful subjection to the state. The south was the natural home of the English establishment; the clergy came in the wake of the gentry, and the parish church was built beside the county court house. The southerner called the name of his new countries after the name of his queens and his kings. Virginia, Carolina, and Georgia all express the notion that the king is the source of authority and the state an entity in and of itself. This southern gentry had all

the virtues and vices of its class. It was given to command; it was brave and adventuresome; it was proud and arrogant; it differentiated the poor from the rich, the landowner from the landless, and put all power in the hands of the landlord; it made labor servile, and subjected the great mass of the laborers to absolute ownership and control of the ruling class.

The southern colonies gave to the nation generals and governors, but not priests nor prophets. Its clergy were the servants of the gentry rather than the servants of God, and the questions that agitated the church in the south were not questions of doctrine or discipline; they were questions of clerical salaries and ecclesiastical status.

The Puritan and southern conception of the relation of the state and the church gave rise to distinct and hostile civilizations which struggled for the mastery on American soil for nearly a century. When at last these two conceptions came into collision the Puritan prevailed over the southern and reduced it to subjection. As in the Revolutionary, so in the Civil War, it was the New England Puritan that gave the spiritual enthusiasm and moral purpose to the struggle. It was Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, John G. Whittier, Owen Lovejoy,

and John Brown that were the prophets and martyrs of the cause. The south in the person of Lincoln gave administrative ability, but the spirit that sustained and guided the contest was the spirit of New England.

The Middle Atlantic states were settled very largely for commercial reasons. It was the canny Hollander, intent on gain, that cast anchor on the shores of Manhattan island and the canny Hollander reigns there still. He was something of a Puritan himself, but his puritanism had never been able to quite get the better of his prudence. His struggle with Spain had been a struggle for existence,—not so much for political and religious liberty as for the right to live. When once the Hollander was free to do as he pleased he turned his attention to commerce and made riches the goal of his ambition. He had neither the political training nor the stiff-necked fanaticism of the English Puritan, but he had a commercial genius which gave him in a single generation the commercial leadership of the world. The commercial instinct of the Hollander made him see at once the vast commercial advantage of the Island of Manhattan, and there he planted his colony and gave a character to that island which it has not

lost to this day. The city on the Island of Manhattan is fast becoming the center of the world's exchanges and the commercial capital of mankind. With this spirit of commercialism the spirit of Puritanism is now in deadly conflict, and upon the issue of that conflict depends, not only the spiritual welfare of the people of America, but also the spiritual history and spiritual welfare of the world for ages to come. The warfare that is waging to-day is the warfare between the merchant and the minister; the minister, who believes in God, the merchant, who believes in gain; the minister, who believes that man is a person, the merchant who believes that man is a thing.

Our study of history has shown us that there are only two possible relations of church and state. Either the church must be in subjection to the state, or the state to the church; that is, either spiritual or material interests must prevail. In all great formative periods it is the spiritual interests that are supreme; in all times of degeneration and decay material concerns have the upper hand. To speak of the separation of church and state is to speak of the separation of soul and body. If the state is without a church it is without warrant in the conscience

of man; if the church is without a state it is without power in the life of the world. The church without the state is a disembodied spirit; the state without the church is a putrefying corpse. When the church is true to itself and true to its God it becomes the conscience of the state. Then the state must be in subjection to the church, or the state must perish. When the church forgets its high calling, and becomes simply a function of the state, then both church and state go down in one common ruin.

The present separation of the religious from the civil and political life of the nation is cause for grave apprehension for the future of the American people. A glance at the religious phenomena of our time and country will reveal strange and startling facts.

Were a Paul of Tarsus to visit us as he visited the Athenians, he would cry to us, as he did to them: "I perceive that in all things ye are very religious." The outward forms of religion are in in evidence with us as they were with the Athenians of the Apostolic age. The Athenian still paid homage by cult and ceremony to the gods of Olympus. He was careful to have the twelve major and all the minor divinities represented by the altars of his city; and,

lest he should have overlooked someone of the heavenly hierarchy, he built an altar to the unknown God. As in Athens, so to-day every phase and form of the great Christian cult is represented in the religious life of America. In this year of grace, the nineteen hundred and fifth, there are 28,689, 028* persons enrolled as Christians upon the books of the various ecclesiastical bodies. These persons are included in 143, more or less, religious córporations which are in competition for membership. The two great sections of Christendom, the Protestant and the Catholic, divide this Christian membership unevenly between them, about two thirds of the Christians of the country are registered in the Protestant societies, and about one third in the Catholic churches.

The Protestants are mainly included in seven great denominations, Methodists, Baptists, Lutherans; Disciples of Christ, Presbyterian, Congregational, and Episcopal.

The Catholics are for the most part emigrants and children of emigrants, who have come into this country since the middle of the last century and who derive their notions of life and government from

*The World Almanac.

Latin and Celtic, rather than from English, sources. Maryland was, indeed, settled by English Catholics dissatisfied, as were the Puritans, with the settlement of Elizabeth. But the Catholics of Maryland, like the Catholics of England, were never sufficiently numerous or important to influence to any degree the polity either of their church or their country. The Catholic church in America to-day is Celtic, Latin, and South Germanic, and embodies the tone and temper of these races rather than of the English. In the Catholic body we have among us the mediæval church and the mediæval Empire. In the government of this vast organization the people have no voice. Power is centralized in the hierarchy; the hierarchy centers in the Pope, who appoints his bishops and sends his legates to rule his people. The Pope and the Czar are the last representatives in Europe of the ancient imperial system of ruling church and state.

The Lutheran body is composed of emigrants and children of emigrants from Protestant Germany. It represents the German love of the Fatherland, and the conservative theological thought of the German people.

Passing to the other Protestant denominations, we

find that the Methodists are the most numerous and the most democratic. The Methodist body owes its origin to that great movement among the English people; led by a simple priest of the Church of England, which broke up the repose of the English establishment, which revived religion and reformed the world. The Methodists in America are the converts and descendants of the converts of those heroic circuit riders who in the latter part of the eighteenth and early part of the nineteenth centuries traveled from settlement to settlement in the wilderness preaching the pardoning grace of God. To these preachers the middle west owes its Christianity and civilization, and the middle west is the chief home of Methodism to this day. The Baptists and the Disciples of Christ form really one great body, and have their principal habitat in the mountainous region of the south. It is in that region that you find to-day a survival of the stern, hardshell, close-communion Baptist, who holds immersion necessary to salvation, and looks upon the unimmersed as outside the covenanted mercies of God. In the north the Baptist communion includes much of the culture and wealth of the country, and, while still practicing the Baptist forms, does not exclude the rest

of Christendom from membership in the church of Christ.

The Presbyterian church represents the sturdy Scotch element in American life. It is strongly English in its political tendencies, and Calvinistic in its theology. Its membership is evenly distributed over the country, and is made up largely of the successful men of business. The Congregational body, together with its offspring, the Unitarian, has its headquarters in Boston, and is most numerous in New England. It is the direct heir of the Puritan, and is the church of the scholar, the reformer, and the mystic. The Episcopal church is the daughter of the Established Church of England, with which it is in communion. It looks to Oxford for its theology, and to the hierarchy of England as the source of its spiritual life. It holds that Episcopal ordination is necessary to the validity of the ministry, and maintains the position of isolation among the Christian churches which is the characteristic of the English communion. It claims to keep the middle way between Romanism and Protestantism, and hopes to bring the whole world to accept its position of compromise. It is divided into two parties, the high and the broad, or conservatives and liberals.

The high church party is strongest with the clergy, and the broad with the laity. This church centers in New York, and its stronghold is the Atlantic seaboard. It is the church of the banker and the lawyer, and leads the conservative element in social and political life. The smaller Christian bodies are the representatives of certain narrow phases of discipline or doctrine, and are not influential in the life and thought of the country.

We find thus, upon examination, that we have 28,000,000 of Christians, officered by 114,000 men divided into eight principal camps; and, when we consider the promise of Jesus that He would be with two or three of His followers, and that He would grant their prayers,—we cannot help asking, What are these Christians praying for to-day? Are they asking for justice in the state, for purity in social life, for honesty and fair dealing in business, for mercy toward the weak and pity for the erring? Are they praying for peace upon earth and good will toward men, And, if so, why are their prayers not answered? Why are we to-day in the hand of the political spoiler? Why are our cities reeking with impurity? Why are our politics our shame and reproach? Why is our society a society of broken

homes and childless women? Why are the weak crying for succor, and the sinner dying for want of pardon?

The Commercialized Church in the Commercialized State.

On the morning of January 30, 1905, the mayor of the city of Rochester, in the state of New York, read an able paper on municipal government before the ministerial association of that city. The mayor opened his discussion with the statement that the church and state have now no organic relation. The only survival of the bond of union which once united these two institutions is the formal acknowledgment of the sovereignty of God which is expressed in the oath of office that the state requires of its officers as they enter upon their duties. This oath of office is a solemn religious act, giving divine sanction to the functions of the legal officer. When the mayor takes this oath he is bound, not simply to the service of the people, but also and more solemnly to the service of God. He is in the highest sense of the word an ordained, consecrated man. Like the King of Israel, he is the Lord's annointed, and to the Lord he must give an account. When an officer of the state takes his oath of office seriously he

makes of the state a religious institution, it rests, not only in the consent of the people, but also upon the will of God. Mr. Lincoln in his first inaugural address declared his intention of maintaining the Constitution and enforcing the laws throughout the length and breadth of the land, and then, pleading with the men of the south, he said: "You have no oath registered in heaven to destroy the government, while I shall have the most solemn one to preserve, protect, and defend it."* Then the great, gaunt man lifted up his hand and called God to witness that in all he did or said he was the servant, not simply of human law, but also of divine justice, and from that day the man went as one who was set apart to the service of God.*

So, the mayor of Rochester, in calling the attention of the ministers to the fact that he "had registered an oath in heaven" to enforce the laws of the city and protect its interests against all comers, certified to his hearers that he, like Melchizedek, King of Salem, was a priest of the most high God and a minister about holy things. I do not think that either the mayor or the ministers recognized the full significance of this passing allusion to the

*Lincoln, 1st Inaugural.

oath of office. I fear both minister and mayor failed to see that the oath of office, if other than an idle form or a bit of blasphemy, gives divine sanction to civil life, and makes of the mayor, a minister of religion.*

This inattention to an important fact and a great underlying principle arose from an inveterate habit on the part of both mayor and minister of inclosing human life into two compartments which have no opening into each other. These compartments are the secular and the sacred. The secular incloses the mayor and all that belongs to him; the sacred incloses the ministers and all that belongs to them. The mayor came to the ministers, as a messenger might come from Mars, to let these inhabitants of another sphere into the secrets of his own planetary existence. With a näiveté that was charming, the mayor took for granted that the ministers would not be interested in anything that lay outside their own circle of being. The only function of the city government which he explained at any length was that which has to do with the closing of the saloons

*The oath of office is simply a declaration of the sacred character of the mayor's office. The oath is nothing; the sacredness everything.

on Sunday. Again, I fear that neither the mayor nor the ministers were conscious of the latent sarcasm that thus, by implication, limited the interests of the ministers. It was nothing to them whether the homes of the people of their city were wholesome or unwholesome; nothing to them whether the officers of their city were honest or corrupt; nothing to them whether the children of their city were being trained to wisdom or to folly; nothing to them whether the streets of their city were hideous or beautiful; nothing to them that the merchants of the city turned girls and women by the thousand out into the streets of the city in the middle of the night, these girls and women exhausted by sixteen hours of toil, left, so far as the merchants were concerned, to become the prey of any passerby. All this was secular, and did not concern the minister. It was the opening of the saloon on Sunday that roused his interest, because Sunday is the little bit of time which he has tried to enclose in his sacred compartment, and claims as his own. The Sunday saloon encroaches upon the territory of the Sunday church, and if the Sunday saloon be opened the ministers fear that the Sunday church may have to be closed, and the occupation of the minister be gone.

I have seen many strange sights in this strange world in which I find myself a sojourner, but never a stranger,—sadder sight than to see four-score men sitting, not only silent, but contented, under an implication that proclaimed their own utter impotence and the impotence of their God. For, if the minister, with God on his side, cannot win out against the barkeeper in a fair and open competition, then what is the use of the minister, and where is the power of his God.

The mayor did say that, if the ministers could get out of their compartment and get into his they could, if they would, help him in the exercise of the functions of his sacred office. The mayor confessed, that with the best will in the world he was not free to do what he thought for the highest interests of the city. Because of a certain evil power which was strong and rampant in his compartment, he was sore let and hindered in doing the work that was set before him, and he prayed the ministers for help. But, as he mentioned the name of this power, every minister that heard that name shuddered; for he knew that the self-same power was in his compartment, keeping him from the full performance of his duty. The name of the power that checked the mayor and throttled the minister was "money."

The church and state might be separate worlds, their orbits intersecting only at the Sunday laws, but they were both revolving in the atmosphere of a corrupt commercialism.*

This power which has silenced the voice of the church and paralyzed the Constitution of the state began to dominate both church and state immediately after the close of the Civil War. In the first or constitutional period of American history, which ended with the administration of John Quincy Adams, the American people were engaged in the work of establishing a stable government which should secure to themselves and to their children the liberties for which they had struggled in the Revolutionary era. In that period the will of the people was supreme in the choice of the officers of the government and the affairs of state were in the hands of men who were consecrated to their task by a sense of obligation to their conscience and their God. Webster in the Senate, Marshall and Story on the Bench, and Quincy Adams in the Presidential chair, were the kind of men found in public life in the first period

*Commerce should be the servant, not the master, of church and state. As a servant, it is ennobling; as a master, a depraving influence in human life.

of our history. At this time our country was mainly agricultural, and the industrial life centered in the farm. Commerce or trading was in the hands of individual merchants, who were known by name, and were directly responsible to the people of their vicinage for their actions. The press was used for the expression of personal opinion, and centered in the editor. The church exercised the office of moral and spiritual guidance; it was mainly Protestant and Puritan, and the minister was a highly respected member of the community. This primitive period of American history was, of course, not perfect, but it was healthy; the state and the church, commerce and agriculture, were each exercising their normal functions. The English race was still fairly pure and immensely prolific, and the family was the seat of a stern domestic government. Divorce was rare, and barrenness uncommon.

The next period of national history, beginning with the election of Andrew Jackson and ending with the close of the Mexican War, was marked by the rise of party politics and the great Irish and German migrations. In this period Americans began to consciously seek office for the sake of the emolument connected therewith. The powerful politician

whose business it was to manipulate conventions and carry elections made his appearance in the persons of Amos Kendall and Thurlow Weed. Our elections from that period have been not simply the contest of two differing policies for supremacy, but a battle of the ins and outs for the offices. During this period the common man of the country became conscious of his power: the old Federal aristocracy gave place to the new democracy, of which Jackson was the type. The vast emigration from Ireland and Germany brought the Catholic church into immediate juxtaposition to the native Protestant bodies and the spiritual force of the country was drawn more and more from the direction of civil and social affairs into the channels of ecclesiastical warfare and theological discussion. The use of steam and machinery stilled the hum of the spinning wheel in the farm house, destroyed in a measure the independence of the farmer, and centered industrial life in the factory and the city. Commerce was still, in this period, in the hands mainly of individual merchants directly responsible to the people. It was a period strongly individualistic and competitive. The leaders of the mercantile world were such men as A. A. Low, George Peabody, and Moses Taylor,

men of high character and strong religious conviction who looked upon their wealth as a trust which they held from God for the use of the people.

With the close of the Mexican War the struggle of the slave power for supremacy reached its acute stage. For the next twenty-five years the people of the United States were absorbed in a contest which was to determine whether this country were to be all slave or all free. The spiritual forces of the country escaping the control of the formal religions, were occupied in the warfare of freedom against slavery. The abolitionist found himself excommunicate. When Thomas Morris, the leader of abolitionism in Ohio, made his famous speech against Clay in the United States Senate, ending with the words: "The negro shall yet be free,"* he was read out of the Democratic party, and became a political outcast, and when he died he was denied burial by the Methodist church. The failure of the church† to grasp the moral significance of the slavery agitation lowered its prestige, and gave its power into the hands of men of the people. The highest type of man in that age was everywhere

*Life of Thomas Morris, B. F. Morris.

†The last defense of slavery was written by the presiding bishop of the Episcopal church.

alienated from the churches. Whittier, the saintly poet; Emerson, the seer; Garrison and Phillips, the prophets; Brown, the martyr; Sumner, the tribune, and Lincoln, the far-seeing moral statesman, were all of them outside and some of them under the ban of the Orthodox churches. The fall of Puritanism as a theological system controlling American thought, which was the consequence of this failure of the ministry as a class to see the moral question involved in the slavery agitation and which was precipitated by the Unitarian secession, left the American people without any formal theological system in which to center their thought and life, and the result is the theological chaos and the religious paralysis in the midst of which we are now living.

The close of the Civil War was followed by moral exhaustion. The prophets and the priests, the martyrs and the soldiers, of the slavery crusade had lost their lives in gaining their cause. Lincoln was dead, Sumner was dead, Whittier was dead, Phillips was dead, Emerson was dead, Beecher was decadent, and over the dead and dying bodies of these heroes a new power arose to claim supremacy in the land, and this power was the power of the merchant. The man of the purse assumed the leadership which had

until then been held by the man of the pen and the man of the sword. Before the people were aware, within ten years of the war, American life was commercialized, and both church and state were in the power of the mercantile class. It was this class, and this class only, that profited by the war. When the war closed the mercantile class were in possession of the bonded debt of the country, which amounted to $2,400, 000,000,* with an annual interest charge of $150,000,000. The mercantile class had paid about 33 1/3 cents in gold on a dollar for these bonds, and had purchased them for the most part, not in money, but in army supplies sold at a fabulous profit. While the soldier was dying on the battlefield, and the people were sacrificing every comfort, the army contractor was growing rich by taking advantage of the necessities of his country. As soon as the war was over the people set to work to pay off every dollar of this debt in gold coin. This determination of the people made the bonds which had been purchased for 33 1/3 cents on the dollar, worth from 110 to 130 cents on the par value. And all this immense accretion of value went to enrich the mercantile class. And it was this war debt which was

*Channing, History United States, p. 559.

the source of their power over the political, social, and religious life of the country.

The era of industrial organization and concentration in which we now live dates with the close of the Civil War. Before the war there had been signs of the coming time. Rochester was the headquarters of one of the earliest of those vast corporations which are now so common in the industrial world. Certain merchants formed a corporation and purchased the stock of the various telegraph companies which were operating in the Western States, and the economies incident upon consolidation and reorganization made these profitless properties profitable, and made the stock which had been purchased at a low rate worth more than its face value. About the same time the railroads of New York and Pennsylvania were consolidated into trunk lines and the New York Central, and Pennsylvania railroad stock became a part of the current wealth of the country. This immense increase of available wealth added to the inflated currency of the country, gave rise to an era of speculative railroad building. Two transcontinental roads were projected and brought to completion, and thousands of miles of rails were laid in the wilderness. Then it was that the money

power began to make itself felt in the political life of the country. For a consideration Congress was persuaded to give millions of acres of the public lands to private corporations, and to loan these corporations millions of money.

The sound of the guns of the Civil War had hardly died away before this foe of civil purity, corrupt commercialism, began to threaten the liberties of the country. In the last Congress of the Johnson administration and the first Congress of the Grant administration the railroad companies had their paid agent in the House of Representatives in the person of Oaks Ames, and the stock of the Credit Mobilier was freely used to secure desired legislation. The name of the Vice-President of the United States was tainted with corruption. The reputation of the most popular politician and statesman of the day was smirched, and his political career arrested. But the main field in which the railroad exploiter evinced his skill was not in the United States Congress with its limited power; it was in the legislatures of the states, and in the common councils of the cities, with their power to grant charters and privileges. I need not rehearse the shameful history of the Gould-Fisk outrage upon the

rights of the people in New York and adjacent states. These men bought legislatures, common councils, and judges of court as they would buy cattle in the market. They entrenched themselves like banditti, and defied the process of law. They made common cause with the Tweed ring in New York, and were as brazen as a harlot in their work of corruption. They bought everything they wanted from judicial integrity to woman's honor, and they paraded their purchase in the sight of the world. They made no secret of the ownership of Judge Cardoza, and Fisk paraded Jessie Mansfield in an open carriage drawn by four horses through the streets of New York. What these men did openly was done secretly on a far more extensive scale by men whose reputation remained untarnished, and who attended divine service with the regularity of a devotee. During his palmy days the anteroom of William Tweed was crowded with leading merchants seeking special privileges and exemptions from the common council of which Tweed was the owner. It was proved in the Lexow investigation that it was really the merchants of New York who employed Croker and gave him his power.

It was at this time that corrupt commercialism

subverted representative government, and substituted personal and semi-imperial government in its room. It did this by laying hold of and manipulating the party organizations in its own interests. This corrupt commercial class had no political, as it has no religious, convictions. It was Republican or Democratic as suited its purposes. Its stronghold was the party primary, which it used to establish and maintain its control of the political life of the country. It left to the people the forms of liberty, but all real power was in the hands of one man, who was the agent of the commercial class in its dealing with the politicians. This system of government has fastened itself as a fungus upon the formal governments of the country, and is slowly but surely sapping their strength and taking away their life. I need not go into detail; the matter is notorious, and the mayor confessed that he, the elected magistrate of the people, was more or less in subjection to this power which the people did not set up, but which was an alliance between the commercial and political classes for the purpose of controlling the official government and making it subservient to their private and personal ends. And what is a mild case of varioloid in Rochester is virulent smallpox

in other and richer cities; and as for the states, the ordinary citizen has quite given them up in despair. He goes through the form of voting for governor, but he knows that he has no more voice in the choice of the governor of the state than the Roman people had in the choice of their consul in the days of the Roman Empire.

It was the commercialization of industry that made possible the commercialization of the state. Before the present organization of industry, in the days of the individual shop and factory, the man who owned the shop or the factory had risen from the ranks of labor in his line of life; his business was the product of his savings and his skill; he was in touch with his workmen as being himself one of them. But immediately before, during, and since the Civil War the owners of the great shops and factories are not skilled workmen; they are simply merchants. They buy and sell human skill and human labor as they buy and sell raw cotton and sugar. This system places the worker entirely at the mercy of the buyer and seller; and the conflict which is now going on between these two classes, is a conflict, not only to determine the relative status of these two classes, but it is to determine the character of

the government of the country for ages to come. The issue of this contest will decide whether America is to be a Democracy of the English type or an Empire of the Roman type; whether the people as a whole are to rule, or be ruled. At present the commercial class rules. It is in possession of the government and makes the laws; it is the employer of the professional and industrial classes, and holds them in subjection; it is in possession of the public utilities, and can levy taxes upon the people without their consent.

It rules in social life as well as in the state, and makes money the measure of the man. "See, there is the great Schwab," said a business man of New York to me one day. "Why the great Schwab?" said I. "Because he is under forty years old, and he is worth so many millions of dollars." "So," said I, "did he earn it by honest toil?" "Oh, no!" "Did he inherit it?" "Oh, no!" "Did he steal it?" "Well, no!" "How did he get it?" "He made it." Then I looked at Mr. Schwab with interest. He was greater than the United States, which cannot make a dollar of money, while Mr. Schwab could make it by the million.

It is this doctrine that money can be made that is

the source of our present distress. The old doctrine that money must be earned, inherited, or stolen gives place to the new doctrine that money can be made; and there are thousands of men who are making it as easily as they light a cigar, and are passing it out to the people. How they do it you can learn from the current literature of the day. This rating of man in terms of money is the mark of Anti-Christ, for a man's life does not consist in the amount of money he has made.

Corrupt commercialism has subsidized the press, centered its control in the counting room, and made its most highly paid functionary the advertising agent. It has taken possession of our streets and made them hideous with poles and wires. It has vulgarized travel, and made the name of America a byword for puerile extravagance on the continent of Europe. It builds churches and gladly listens to the preaching of the gospel and insists on the orthodoxy of its doctrine, but it is careful to keep the minister with his gospel in that closed compartment over the door of which it writes the mystic word "sacred," and in which it does not permit the common affairs of every-day life to be so much as men-

tioned, lest they should disturb the holy quiet of the place.

It goes without saying that there are high-minded men in the commercial class, who deplore present conditions as sadly as the sternest moralist in the land. But what can they do? Such a merchant was once speaking to me of the evil effects which came from the employment of women in certain departments of commercial enterprise. "Why do you not stop it in your establishment?" said I. "Blank, Blank, & Company cannot regulate the commercial life of the United States," was the answer. And that is the substance of the whole matter. You and I, together with Blank, Blank, & Company are in the power of a state-church whose god is gain, whose heaven is commercial success, whose hell is commercial failure. This commercial state-church is the keeper of the keys of its heaven and hell. It can admit to the heavenly light of commercial prosperity, or it can shut out into the darkness of commercial adversity. In matters of religion it is lordly tolerant. You can believe anyone of the one hundred and forty creeds of Christendom that you please. You can belong to this or that political party; but there is one thing you must do or die.

You must go to the plain of Dura and at the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of music, you must fall down and worship the golden image which this modern Nebuchadnezzar has set up. And the question now confronting the American people, and especially the people who profess and call themselves Christians, is, What are you going to do about it? Dare you, like Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, trust your God and brave the fire, or are you ready at the very first note of the cornet to fall down and worship the golden image which Nebuchadnezzar has set up?

Present State of the Churches.

In his address before the Ministerial Association, the mayor of Rochester said, in effect, that the gentlemen before him could have any kind of a city government that they really desired. This statement, I take it, was based upon the fact that the ministerial association represented the moral sentiment of the community, and that in the long run it is the moral sentiment of the community that creates and continues civic institutions. Our municipal, state and national governments can never go far below, nor rise far above, the average moral status of the people. Legislatures can make laws, but the legislatures cannot enforce them. If the law does not express the moral judgment of the people, it becomes a dead letter. If, then, the ministers of the churches are the moral force of the community; if they are the accredited teachers of the national morality; if the people look to them for guidance,—then it follows as a matter of course that whatever government the ministers want the ministers can have. But, as a matter of fact, if there

is one class more than another which is shut out from civic influence and political activity, that class is the ministerial. It is not considered becoming for a minister so much as to express an opinion on any subject of current politics. He is a minister of religion, and in the popular estimation religion and politics have nothing to do with each other. Not only is the minister thus excluded from all direct participation (except that he may cast his secret ballot) in the political life of the community in which he lives, but he is not expected, nor even permitted, to have anything to say in regard to the great industrial and economic questions that engage the attention of the people. In the conflict between capital and labor neither the capitalist nor the laborer has any use for the minister. In 1901 the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church appointed a standing commission on capital and labor, having among other duties that of "being in readiness to act as arbitrators, should their services be desired, between men and their employers, with a view to bring about mutual conciliation and harmony in the spirit of the Prince of Peace." This commission reporting in 1904 says: "Taking the definitions of our duty in reverse

order, we have to say regarding *arbitration* that no request for our services has been received." During the three years from 1901 to 1904 the industrial world was the scene of strikes and lockouts, which disturbed the peace of the country and caused the waste of millions of money; but in no case did the contending parties turn to this commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church or any other church commission for a solution of their difficulties. If a clergyman like the distinguished Catholic Bishop of Peoria was placed upon the arbitration commission it was not because he was a clergyman, but because he had as a man interested himself in and informed himself concerning the great issues involved. For the churches and the ministers as such there is no part cast in the great drama of social evolution which now occupies the stage of the world. There is one field of human effort which fifty or sixty years ago the clergyman claimed as his own. The education of the youth of the country was then almost exclusively in the hands of the ministers of religion. The presidents of our larger colleges and universities and likewise of our smaller colleges, and the head masters of our academic

schools, were of necessity and as a matter of course ordained ministers of some one of our religious denominations. The teaching profession was largely ministerial in its makeup. So that one might almost take it for granted that a professor in a college was also a clergyman. But during the last fifty years the province of education has passed from under the power of the clerical body into the possession of the laymen. The presidents of all our larger universities and colleges are laymen, and if some of our smaller colleges are still required by their charters to have a clergyman as their head, then such clergyman is careful not to emphasize his clerical character; in dress, in manner, in thought, he is in accord with the lay, rather than with the ministerial, world. Our academic schools, following the lead of our universities and colleges, are seeking their teaching staff among laymen, and if by chance they do employ a clergyman they take care that he is not clergyman enough to hurt him. And as for the great public school system which the people have created for the education of their children, that, as we too well know, is not only free from, but antagonistic to, clerical influence. There is nothing that the people resent

more quickly than the interference on the part of any church or denomination with the common schools of the country.

As the clergyman looks out on the world to-day he is apt to cry: "Where do I come in?" He finds himself debarred from any real and active participation in the political, industrial, educational, or social life of the world in which he lives. And in this enforced isolation his manhood withers and his interest in life dies out.

Now, if we seek for the reason of this waning of ministerial influence we find it in that divorce of what is called religion from life which is the characteristic of the modern world. Religion has no place in our politics, no place in our business, no place in our education, no place in our society. Its province, if it have any, lies outside our everyday life and far beyond our everyday thought. We hear on every side of the evil of divorce, the breaking of the bond of union between husband and wife, but what divorce is more desolating than the divorce of life from religion; these are not simply husband and wife, one of which can die and the other live, but they are body and soul, neither of which can really exist without the other. If it

were the fact that life and religion were parted asunder never to come together again, then life would be worthless and would soon end in despair, and go down into the gloom of death.

But the truth is that religion is entering into life and spiritualizing every department thereof as it has not since the primitive days. It is not dying out; it is only changing its mode of operation. It refuses any longer to be shut up in churches, and is striving to make itself a home in the street, in the shop, in the market, in the common council chamber.

The clerical order is losing influence, not because the world is growing less religious, but because it is more religious that it was sixty years ago. Religion has to-day a wider scope and a farther reach than the clerical interpretation permits it to have.

The churches and denominations, which now claim to represent the religious interests of mankind, are the rear-guard of the powers that make for religious progress. They are the product of spent forces. The Catholic church is the survival in the modern world of the imperialistic system that from the fourth to the fourteenth centuries was the system common to both church and state; in which all men were in theory subjects of the Emperor and

the Emperor the subject of the Pope. In this system the people are in bondage to the clergy, who claim to stand between them and God, and from whose lips the people must receive knowledge. The Pope, shut up in the Vatican, is a sign to the world of the status of the Catholic church. It is permitted to exist only so long as it secludes itself from the activities of every-day life. It is imperialistic in its government, and unscientific in its teaching, and it has no place in a democratic and scientific age. The great national churches of north Europe and England are the creation of the spirit of monarchy and of privilege; they are the handiwork of the Kings, the nobles, and the gentry and mark the triumph of the King, the nobles, and the gentry over the Pope and the Emperor. These churches are aristocratic in government and unscientific in doctrine, and have no place in a democratic and scientific age. The great denominations, such as the Methodist and the Baptist, are composed mainly of the middle class. They represent the revolt of the tradesman against the domination of the gentry. These denominations are occupied with minor morals, are unscientific in their doctrine, and are out of touch with the workmen and the poor,

who in our day are slowly and painfully emerging from their servile state, and are claiming a name and a place for themselves in the regulation of the affairs of the world.

The great salient fact in the present life of the western world is the democratic revolution. This revolution has been in progress for six hundred years, and has proceeded by regular stages. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries it delivered the Kings from the domination of the church and the Empire; in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries it made the Kings subordinate to the nobility and the gentry; in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the middle class became dominant, the manufacturer and the shopkeeper drove the nobility and gentry from power, and now this class is struggling for supremacy with the common people, with the hand worker and the wage earner, in whose supremacy the democratic revolution will reach its goal. It is with this phase of the revolution that the world is now occupied, and in this crisis the organized churches are not, for the most part with the rising people, but are either indifferent or are with the dominant class. The churches stand for privilege; the bishops in the Episcopal churches

are a privileged class among the clergy; the clergy are a privileged class among the people; the wealthy are a privileged class in society. But privilege of any and every kind is becoming every day more and more odious. Equality, political, social, and intellectual, is a constantly growing demand, and all institutions that stand simply upon privilege are passing away. The democratic revolution is the working out into the life of the world of the life and teaching of Jesus. The only privilege which He claimed for himself, or allowed to others was the privilege of service and sacrifice, and that is the only privilege that can endure in the day of the social revolution that is at hand.

But if the churches are wanting in the democratic spirit which is necessary to any wide influence in the present revolutionary era, they are still more wanting in the scientific spirit, without which it is impossible for any institution, no matter how venerable, to have any intellectual standing in the modern world. The universe of thought in which we live is the product of the scientific movement, and the work of the scientific movement has been to substitute law for miracle as the basis of all the operations of nature. In the primitive ages man

was under the dominion of his fears and of his imagination, and the world of thought in which he lived was necessarily imaginary. His thought world was not the product of his reason; it was the creation of his fancy. He viewed the universe about him, not in the clear light of dispassionate intelligence, but in the refracted light of his hopes and his fears. For him nature was without unity and without continuity. His terrified soul filled the earth and the air with beings, like himself, only more powerful, who used the forces of nature for the purpose of expressing their pleasure or displeasure. All ancient religion was based upon the miracle; upon the belief that there are beings, like men, only greater, who can use the forces of nature to attract attention and to express their love or their hatred. In all history the gods are simply deified men, who, instead of smiting with the arrow or striking with the sword, smite with the pestilence or strike with the lightning.

The theory of the miracle looks upon every event in nature as having reference to the well- or ill-being of some particular man or men. When religion is based upon miracle then a flood of water, or a volcanic eruption, is looked upon as a direct visitation

of the wrath of God. The religion of miracle which the primitive imagination created held full possession of the world down to the beginning of the scientific era; which era may be roughly dated from the publication by Copernicus of De Orbium Cœlestium Revolutionibus in 1530, which affirmed the fact of the revolution of the earth upon its axis and its annual journey around the sun. From that day to this the religion of the reason has been in conflict with the religion of the fancy, and truth has been contending with imagination. Slowly, but surely, scientific reason has reconstructed the universe. It has driven the vast horde of ancient gods and demons into the limbo of things impossible. It has made the primitive miracle incredible, because the ancient miracle and the modern conception of law cannot coexist in the same mind. Under the pressure of the scientific conception of uniformity and continuity the miracle has been driven from one stronghold to another until now it is making a last and desperate stand in one region of the world and in one period of time. The ordinary Christian does not give a moment's serious consideration to the miracles of which he reads in the history of Greece and Rome, or which he finds in the literature of the

east. He does not go into any long course of reasoning to prove or disprove these stories; he sets them down at once as the myth, the legend, the folk-lore, of the Roman, Greek, and Indian peoples. The Protestant views with impatient indignation the miracles of the Catholic church in the middle ages, and derides the miracles which the same church claims to perform at the present day. The vast mass of sensible Christians look upon the cures effected by the Christian Scientist, not as miraculous, but as being partly the operation of well-known laws of psychological therapeutics and partly mere delusion. But in spite of their rejection of all miracles in the so-called pagan world, in the mediæval church, and in modern times, the great Protestant national churches and denominations base all their teaching upon the miracle. They claim that their religion is the one exception in the religious history of the world. All other religions are the product of historical causes. The ancient religions sprang from man's imaginative interpretation of nature. They contained elements of eternal truth, but in their conception of the relation of the gods to the natural world everyone knows that they were in error. But, when we

come to our own religion, we affirm what we deny in regard to the religions of ancient and mediæval times, and we base our belief in our miraculous religion upon our possession of a miraculous book.

Of course, a belief in the inerrancy of the Bible is no longer possible to an educated man, or for anyone in fact, who reads his Bible with reasonable intelligence and attention. It does not need profound scholarship; it only requires ordinary common sense, to see that the Bible is not the miraculous book which orthodox theology claims it to be. It is not the higher critic; it is the ordinary modern reader, who has reverently placed his Bible among the great literatures of the world, and finds that both he, himself and his Bible have gained immensely by the operation. He can read his Bible now with pleasure and profit, since, in reading, he does not have to outrage his intelligence.

In the light of scientific research, the Founder of Christianity no longer stands apart from the common destiny of man in life and death, but He is in all things physical like as we are, born as we are born, dying as we die, and both in life and death in the keeping of that same Divine Power,

that heavenly Fatherhood, which delivers us from the womb and carries us down to the grave. When we come to know Jesus in His historical relations, we see that miracle is not a help, it is a hindrance, to an intelligent comprehension of His person, His character, and His mission.* We are not alarmed, we are relieved when scientific history proves to us that the fact of His miraculous birth was unknown to Himself, unknown to his mother, and unknown to the whole Christian community of the first generation.

Believing this, we are no longer compelled to look upon the scientific movement as irreligious, but are able to see in it a greater confirmation of religion; a scientific religion based, not upon the sporadic miracle, but upon the eternal law. We are no longer compelled to look for our God in some obscure event of the past. We have but to lift up our eyes to see Him in the outgoings of the evening and the morning, of all the days of our pilgrimage.

The scientific movement has within the last fifty years acquired a momentum that is irresistible.

---

*Encyclopedia Biblica, vol. 3, p. 294; Hasting's Dict. of Bible, vol. III. p. 286.

It has taken possession of every educational institution from the kindergarten of the common school to the post-graduate course of the great universities. The theological seminaries are the only educational institutions which have not adopted the scientific method of investigation and reasoning. In resisting the scientific movement the churches are resisting the inevitable. For twenty-five hours in every week our children are taught by trained instructors that the miracle has no place in nature, and then for twenty-five minutes in every week our children are taught, by untrained instructors, when they see fit to come to our Sunday Schools, that the universe is based upon miracle. For one hundred and sixty-seven hours in every week all our thought and our action is based upon the conviction that the miracle has no place in nature. We trust ourselves and all that we have to our unfaltering belief in the unchanging laws of the universe,—this for one hundred and sixty-seven hours; and then for one hour a few of us, when it is convenient, go to our churches and pretend to believe that the universe is based upon miracle. In our lecture rooms, in our laboratories, in our factories, in our counting rooms, we utterly discard the mode

of reasoning which we use in our churches. The clergyman himself discards his pulpit method when he comes to deal with the practical affairs of life or with the miracles of the Hindu, the Catholic, or the Christian Scientist. And yet with this fact of the complete divorce of theological thought from living thought staring us in the face, we wonder why the people do not come to the churches, and marvel at the waning of ministerial influence.

The scientific movement is not only constructing the thought world in which mankind must live for ages to come, but it is also profoundly influencing the political, social, and industrial life of the world. Science has unified the world to an extent and in a way that the old religions never dreamed of. The God of science is not the God of the Hebrew, nor of the Christian. He is the God of the whole earth, and not only of the earth, but of the infinite reach of the heaven. The man of science knows his God as God has never been known before. He is face to face with his God every moment of his life. He has learned through long experience to believe in that God, who is the Father of Lights,

with whom there can be no variation, nor shadow that is cast by turning.

The life of the man of science is necessarily favorable to the development of the religious character. What can be more ennobling than an intense love of truth for truth's sake? There is not in all religious history a more saintly character than that of Charles Darwin. His patience, his self-restraint, his quiet, uncomplaining endurance of pain and calumny, are as indicative of spiritual power and of true religious character as are the mortifications of St. Bernard or the ecstacies of St. Teresa. It cannot be by accident that the breath of scandal has never soiled the name of any of the great leaders of science. The man of science finds his God as David, Job, and Jesus found theirs. For Him, "the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork;" for him are unloosed the bands of Orion and the sweet influences of the Pleiades. He sees the glory of God in the grass of the field, and the providence of God in the fall of the sparrow. There may be elements of religion lacking in the man of science, but in his

love of truth, in his reverence for law, in his respect for fact, in his hold upon reality, the man of science is not as the unenlightened church member thinks, —an unbeliever, but a profound believer. He has a faith in his convictions which is beyond the faith of the mediæval saint. Science is not simply a philosophy, it is a passionate religion, and a religion that is unifying the world. A German physician discovers the X-ray, and in six months' time the X-ray is used in every hospital from the rising to the setting of the sun for the alleviation of human misery. It is science that has made possible the great industrial organizations that are the wonder and the terror of the industrial world. A trust magnate told me that the telephone was the cause of the trust. Industrial commercialism is wiser in its day and generation than the churches of light. It is not afraid of the truth. It rewards discovery with its greatest prizes—while in the churches even to this day, discovery is a crime, and invention is of the devil. No reason for the loss of ministerial influence is so potent as the fact that the churches stand outside this great movement for unity which is the characteristic movement of the modern world. Being unscientific, the churches cannot account for

themselves, nor for any of the religious phenomena of the world. They one and all have to plead the miracle as the reason of their own existence and of the present state of the world.

The forces of formal Christianity are ineffective because they are disorganized, demoralized, and divided. Churches and denominations nullify the efforts each of the other. Episcopal bishops do all they can to defeat the purposes of the Catholic bishops. The Catholic bishops look upon the Episcopal bishops as both schismatic and heretical and as enemies of Christ and the church. The uneducated Protestant looks upon the great Catholic church as the work of the devil, and the uneducated Catholic looks upon the Protestant as the child of Satan. The educated man, both Catholic and Protestant, is becoming ashamed of this condition, and the laymen are leaving the quarrel entirely in the hands of the clergy. As for the outside world, it looks upon this dispute with amused vexation and with, "A plague on both your houses," goes about its business. While the churches are without unity, they must be without influence. The ministerial body cannot be the servant of the people as long as it is the servant of its denomina-

tional formularies. These formularies cannot be all true; and it follows that in some respects all these formularies are false. The only way the formularies can be tested is by the scientific method, and the scientific method the churches resolutely refuse to use; and, therefore, the churches are hopelessly divided and helpless.

We ministers seem to me like a man traveling in the night, who falls over a precipice; in his fall he seizes upon some uneven surfaces of the rock. With one hand he holds on to the miracle, with the other he holds on to his denominational difference. All night long he sweats blood in his agony, as he feels his hands loosening upon the crumbling stone, and fears that at any moment he may fall into the black abyss of Atheism that yawns beneath him. But if he would only let go he would find himself on the solid earth, and would hear a voice saying to him: "Hear, O man! the Lord thy God is one Lord; and to love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and all thy strength, and all thy mind, and to love thy neighbor as thyself, is more than the creeds and the churches."

As long as we, the ministers, are desperately holding on to the waning miracle and to the crumbling

denominational difference we are in no condition to fight for eternal truth and justice. We are trying in a pitiful way to get back into real life through what we call the institutional churches. The apostle serves tables, and the prophet becomes a teacher in gymnastics; and we think we have done a great thing in doing for the people what they can do much better for themselves. Meanwhile the message of the Master is not carried, and the Word of the Lord is not spoken.

Hear, now, oh ye churches, the sum of the whole matter: There are three great spirits at work creating the world that is and that is to be: The spirit of scientific investigation, that will know nothing but the truth; the spirit of democratic revolution, which will trust no one but the people; the spirit of social evolution, which will call no man common or unclean. If the churches wish for influence in the world that is and is to be, they must master these spirits and make them their own. The churches must become scientific, democratic, and socialistic. And, if they do so, then the churches will merge into the church and the church will no longer be separate from the state, nor the state from the church, but these two will be one flesh.

The American Church-State.

In his address before the ministerial association the mayor of Rochester urged upon his hearers the necessity of attending the primary elections if they wished to have any real influence in the government of their city. He pointed out the fact that these primaries are the source of political power. At these primaries delegates are chosen to the various party conventions, which conventions declare public policies and name candidates for public office. The primary is the headwater of our political and social life, and upon its purity depends the health of the community. It would seem, therefore, the duty of every citizen to guard the primary from all contamination, and as the ministers are, by office, the guardians of the moral well-being of the state, they of all men ought to watch over the primaries. But the suggestion that the ministers should directly influence the primaries, as the primaries of the great parties are now conducted, is a suggestion that would call forth a sneer and a laugh. The minister can be present at the primary

only by the complete abdication, not simply of his ministerial office, but also of his religious feelings and of his moral character. He would seek in vain in the primary for any evidence of religious sentiment or moral principle. If the primary were held in a room, that room would reek with tobacco smoke, and the men in that place would not hesitate to desecrate it with their coarseness, their profanity, and their obscenity. A closer acquaintance would reveal the fact that moral considerations have no place in the transactions of the primary. No fear of public ill, no hope of public good, has lodgment in the heart of any man in that meeting. Everyone who is an actor in that scene seems moved by some low, petty desire. The managing mind of the meeting is some professional politician whose sole purpose is to keep his hold on the party organization for personal and mercenary reasons. The names of the men on the ticket presented to the minister and for whom he is expected to vote are, for the most part, names of men of whom he has never heard before, and of whose standing and character he is wholly ignorant. And then there is the appalling fact that in the primary a large proportion of the voters can be influenced by the most

paltry motives. A dollar or less in money, the promise of a day's work, a pat on the back by the leader of the ward, a glass of liquor, is all that is needed to secure the support of this riff-raff of the saloon that is gathered into this meeting to determine the destinies of the American people.

Beside all this, the primary is not what it pretends to be. It is not a meeting of free citizens for the purpose of selecting men who shall represent them and declare their will in the formulation of public policies and the nomination of public officers. The men in the meeting are not acting freely; they are obeying the behests of a sinister outside influence which has predetermined their action. A moral and religious man has the same grief and pain of soul in a modern political primary that he has in a brothel; in the one, as in the other, he sees the prostitution of the highest and holiest to the most degrading and basest use. In his estimation the prostitution of the functions of the state to private, personal, and mercenary ends is even more appalling and disastrous than the prostitution of woman. The poison of the one may be kept within bounds, but the evil virus of the other corrupts the whole body politic. Now it is evident that a min-

ister of religion cannot be present as a participant in the doings of the primary any more than he can be present as a participant in the doings of a house of shame. His very presence there is a rebuke or a surrender. If he dares to exercise his office of a prophet, and reprove the iniquity of the primary, he is told in language more forcible than polite that the primary is not a prayer meeting. He is made to understand in the most unmistakable manner that religion is not politics, nor politics religion.

In the great majority of American minds this assertion that politics is not religion would have the force of a self-evident axiom; and yet the whole history of the world proves that while religion is much more than politics yet politics is religion. Woodrow Wilson* in his treatise on "The State," speaking of the government of the ancient Greek cities, says: "In every way the political life of the city spoke of religion. There was a city hearth in the prytaneum on which a fire sacred to the city's gods was kept ceaselessly burning; there were public repasts at which, if not the whole people, at least representatives sat down to break the sacred

*Woodrow Wilson, The State, p. 31.

cake and pour out the consecrated wine to the gods; the council feast to which the King invited the elders, though also a social feast, was first of all a sacred, sacrificial repast, over which the King presided by virtue of his priestly office. There were festivals at certain times in honor of the several deities of the city, and the council always convened in a temple. Politics was a religion."

And what is true of ancient Greece is true of all great nations and all pure politics. Gerritt Smith, in his pamphlet on "The one test of character," has expressed this thought so aptly that I will give it in his words: "We are told, that a church should not meddle with politics. There is, however, nothing on earth that should give it more concern. Politics, rightly interpreted, are the care of all for each,—the protection afforded by the whole people to every one of the people; and hence a church might better omit to apply the principles of Christ to everything else than to politics. Manifestly, I am not speaking here of the satanic politics, which have ever cursed every part of the world, but of the heaven-commanded and heaven-imbued politics, which have never yet extended their blessed sway over any people."

It is only a passing phase of modern thought that has attempted to separate the religious and political interests of mankind. In the great permanent thought of the world politics is religion. Politics was religion when Moses led the Children of Israel up and out of Egypt and laid the foundation of the Hebrew state in the ten commandments. Politics was religion when Isaiah poured his inspired scorn on the Egyptian policy of the Jewish politicians, and when Jeremiah sternly condemned Jehoiakim the son of Josiah, King of Judah, to the burial of an ass. Politics was religion when Jesus, the Son of David, based the Kingdom of God on the beatitudes and the five negative laws of righteousness. Politics was a religion when the Greeks, inspired by Athena and led by Mars, saved European civilization on the field of Marathon. Politics was a religion throughout the whole period of republican purity in Rome. Every Roman believed that Romulus had built the city on the hill that the gods had chosen, and that Numa, their law-giver, was inspired with wisdom by a divinity. Politics was religion in the days of Charlemagne when he took churchmen into his council and made Alcuin the chief adviser of the state. Politics was religion

when Henry of Germany sought Bruno of Toul to work with him for the restoration of order in Europe. Politics was religion when Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, at a meeting of the barons, at St. Paul's Cathedral, produced the charter of Henry I. and made it the basis of the Great Charter of English liberties, which the bishops and barons compelled John to sign at Runnymede. Politics was religion when Cromwell and his Ironsides swept the armies of Charles I. from the field of Marston Moor, and destroyed forever the doctrine of the divine right of Kings to rob and oppress the people. Politics was religion when the Pilgrims in the cabin of the Mayflower in the presence and fear of God constituted themselves a commonwealth, and made themselves the seed corn of the great American nation. Politics was religion when George Washington knelt in the snows of Valley Forge and prayed for the political salvation of his people, and when the same man went from St. Paul's church in New York city to his inauguration as first President of the United States. Politics was religion when Abraham Lincoln, in his second inaugural, gave utterance to the spirit of religious consecration which for four years had

kept him steadfast to a sacred duty, and, with malice toward none, with charity toward all, laid his life a sacrifice on the altar of his country. Politics was religion when Theodore Roosevelt, leaving the limitations of his office, acting as the high priest of American morality and religion, compelled the labor leaders and the coal operators to come before him and settle their quarrel that was bringing misery upon the poor and anarchy upon the nation. Politics was religion in the city of Rochester when ministers left their churches and women the sacred retirement of their homes and went upon the political platform to plead for the purity and integrity of our public school system, and to secure to our children an education based upon the science of pedagogy, and not upon the necessities of the spoilsman. Politics is religion because it has to do with major morals, with the relations of men to each other in communities, with honesty in trade, with gentleness in action, with truth in speech. The nation exists as a polity for the purpose of detecting dishonesty, for suppressing violence, and for discovering truth and uncovering falsehood. The one cry that goes up from man to God is for justice. All the prophets from Moses to Jesus de-

clare it to be the will of God that righteousness be done in the earth. God is righteousness and in righteousness is His Kingdom established.

And the nation, the state, and the city have no other function than to translate righteousness into the definite forms of justice. When the Constitutional Convention of 1787 sent forth the Constitution which it devised for the government of the nation it did so in these words: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our children, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Now can any man write a more perfect description of the Kingdom of God on earth or in heaven than is to be found in these words? A government resting upon such principles as these is not a godless policy; it is a holy religion; and all the more so because the religion is unconscious, resting in

the great eternal laws of justice as surely and serenely as the earth rests in the law of gravitation.

When the people of the United States decreed by constitutional amendment that the government should never by law establish any religion, they did actually establish the only religion that could comprehend in its membership the whole American people. A religion having as its basis the principles of individual liberty and obedience to righteous law is really the religion of the golden rule. Nor has this religion been simply a theory powerless to work righteousness in the world. It has created a great and happy people. Never before in the history of the world have so large a number of human beings lived together under one government, so little restrained by governmental control; with so many opportunities, with so many advantages, intellectual, social, and physical, as are now living in the United States of America. This population has come from every region of the earth and from races most alien to each other, and yet, under the influences of the religious principles underlying the American republic, these alien elements have been welded into one compact American citizenship. This wonder has come to pass in

a way so simple that it has escaped observation. By a sublime instinct the American people have created the organ that has resolved race and religious differences into the larger life of a common citizenship. Gently, but firmly, the people withdrew the education of the children from under the hand of all lesser religions, and placed it in the power and keeping of the larger religion of the state.* The common school is the great resolvent. The German, the Italian, the Pole, the Hun, enter that school and come out Americans. In my neighborhood are Italians who in a single generation have become ardent Americans. They speak the language of the country and understand the genius of its laws. Without the public school the United States would be an undigested mass of alien races. By means of the public school we are a homogeneous people. We are told that the public schools have no religion. But if religion be love, and joy, and peace in the holy air of God, then the public schools have done more to promote true religion than all the churches in the land. What the

*The religion of the churches has to do with the salvation of the individual, the religion of the state with the salvation of the community; hence it is the greater.

churches and denominations are doing their utmost to prevent the common schools are accomplishing. They are uniting the American people in a great common religion,—a religion based upon the scientific method which finds God in the present truth: a religion which is democratic, and finds the highest expression of law in the common judgment of the whole people; a religion which is socialistic in that it is controlled by the social organism, the state, and knows no distinction of rank or class, and looks only to the public welfare. As I look about the city of my residence, and see our beautiful schoolhouses, with their splendid equipment, and know that, so far as this city is concerned, this mighty molding institution is guided and governed by the single purpose of giving to the children the best physical, intellectual, and moral training of which the children are capable and which the appliances can secure, then, like John in the presence of Jesus, I say these must increase, while we must decrease.

All church and denominational differences are melting away under the warmth generated by the public school. We cannot hold our young in our different churches, because they have learned in

our public schools that our differences are not essential. They see no moral difference between the Methodist and the Baptist, between the Episcopalian and the Presbyterian, between the Catholic and the Protestant, between the Jew and the Christian. They see that the common humanity is greater than the denominational difference. And we have all come to believe with our children. In our business, in our social intercourse, in our intellectual life, all sectarian differences have disappeared. In life we have made, not creed but character, the test of our approval. It is only on Sunday that we go to our churches and work hard to keep our belief that it is necessary to be a Presbyterian or a Baptist, a Methodist or an Episcopalian, a Catholic or a Protestant, a Jew or a Christian, in order to be acceptable to God. But the children are learning better than all this. They are reading the story of man as it is found in the myth, the legend, the folk-lore and the chronicles of all peoples, and comparing this story with that of the Hebrew people, they see at once that the history of this people is not exceptional. That it has its elements of myth and legend and folk-lore as well as the Greek and the Hindu. So our children are begin-

ning to catch a glimpse of that God, whose revelation has come, not to one, but to all, nations,—a God who revealed Himself to our Aryan forefathers by the name of Varuna in the stars; who inspired the Greek with the worship of Athena in the air; who made Himself known to Moses as Jehovah in the burning bush; and by the mouth of the prophet cried: This is the name whereby He shall be called, "The Lord our Righteousness." By the study of comparative religion our children are learning that God manifested Himself to the Aryan races as Light and Power, to the Semetic races as Justice, Mercy, and Truth. And in the last age He focused these two great religions in the person of Jesus, the Christ, who is to us Righteousness and Peace and the Light that lighteneth every man that cometh into the world.

This great church-state of America has driven out the age-long hatred of the Christian toward the Jew. In this church-state the Jew finds every disability removed. He is honored or dishonored just as he does or does not do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with his God. It is only a few Sundays ago that an honored Jewish Rabbi spoke

with acceptance from a Presybterian pulpit. And yet we cannot read the signs of the times.

It is because the interests committed to the state are so vast that the primary, which is the source of political power, is so vitally important. Our city government has not only the education of our young, it has our lives, our property, our health, in its keeping. The two ministers of religion who are doing the most for the common salvation to-day are the mayor and the health officer. The mayor is devoting himself with unselfish ardor to the public welfare. The health officer, who has many of the characteristics of the mediæval saint, has saved the lives of hundreds of children. Formerly the average number of funerals of children dying of cholera morbus in this parish in the month of August was five. In the last few years we have not had one,—thus proving that scientific religion is, at least, the physical salvation of the people.

If there is one point on which I would take issue with the mayor in his admirable address it is the importance which he seemed to ascribe to party organizations. Parties are simply voluntary organizations of the people for the purpose of securing

the adoption of certain governmental policies. Parties have no legal existence; the breath of the people creates them, and the breath of the people can blow them away. The mayor seemed to think that there was some party organization that could stand between the people and their will. No such party organization exists or ever did exist. Three great parties have served the uses of the American people in the course of their history. The Federalist party, which under the leadership of Madison and Hamilton brought about the union of the states under the Federal Constitution; the Democratic party, which under the leadership of Jefferson and Van Buren secured the safety of the nation by placing it on the broad foundation of manhood suffrage; the Republican party, which saved the Union from destruction and delivered the country from the curse of slavery. The so-called Whig party under the leadership of Webster continued the work of the Federalist in consolidating the Union, and under the leadership of Clay was a party of factious opposition. The Federalist party passed quietly away when its work was done. The Democratic party, after ruling almost uninterruptedly for sixty years, came under the malign influence of the

slave power, lost the confidence of the people, and went down to defeat in 1860, from which defeat it has never been able fully to recover. The Republican party was the creation of that religious enthusiasm which looked upon slavery as an abomination in the sight of God. It was the moral sentiment of the country that gave existence to the party of Lincoln, and the people have not yet forgotten the years of stress and storm through which they were carried by this political organization. But there is nothing sacred about the Republican or any other party; it must serve the people, or it must perish. There is more than a strong suspicion abroad that both of the existing political parties are under the malign influence of a corrupt commercialism. It is the belief of an increasing number that our laws are being made, not in the interest of the whole people, but in the interests of a special class. We see our common councils, our state legislatures, even our national Congress, sacrificing the common welfare to individual and corporate greed. This corrupt commercialism is making merchandise of our office-holding class, bribing the dishonest and brow-beating the honest. Now let this suspicion ripen into conviction, and the party

or parties responsible for this condition will be swept out of existence by a more everwhelming defeat than that which befel the Whig party in 1852, or the Democratic party in 1872. Parties are for the people, and not the people for parties.

And it is with the people that all parties, states, and churches have at last to reckon. As long as these organizations in any way serve the purposes of the people, the people will serve the organizations, and will continue them in being. But as soon as an organization ceases to respond altogether to the demands of the people then that organization is on its deathbed, and its passing away is only a question of time. Every organization, social, political, and religious, carries within itself the principles of its own dissolution. Organizations are to the life of the race what the human body is to the life of man. They are subject to disease, old age, decay, and death. In the day of our Lord Jesus Christ those forms of civil and religious life in which men had lived for ages had lost their power to satisfy the souls of men, and the people of western Asia and of Europe forsook the temple and the synagogue, abandoned the forum, and the academy, and created the Christian church and the Christian

nations. For a thousand years the mediæval church was the teacher, the guide, the protector, of the people of Europe. The church exercised over the nations the care and the authority of a parent, but in the fourteenth century the parent had grown old and decrepit, while the children had come to man's estate. The church could no longer meet the requirements of the people, in consequence of which the people went out of the church by the millions and established the national churches as a temporary refuge. Not finding these national churches adequate to their spiritual needs, multitudes of the people seceded from them and created the great denominations.

To-day the denominations, as well as the national churches, are failing to satisfy the demands of the new age, and the people are leaving them by the millions, and are seeking new forms for the expression of their spiritual and moral life. It is in vain that the churches and denominations plead their age in justification of their authority; for their age is the one thing that is against them. It is because they are old and have lost their power of adaptability that they are losing their hold upon the intelligence of men. The churches and the denomina-

tions are living to-day upon their past achievements. Men honor them and reverence them more for what they have done than for what they are doing. The Catholic Church sits in the modern world as the aged grandparent of modern civilization. As such we owe her veneration, but not obedience. Her thoughts and wishes, like all the thoughts and wishes of the aged, dwell in the past. Her pontiff sits in the Vatican, and dreams of the good old times, when all men were subject to the church, and the church was obedient to the Pope. But, sad though it be, the good old times will never come again. The authority of the Catholic church over the reason and conscience of mankind is gone forever.

The national churches and the denominations are the parents of the existing order; but they, too, have reached a point when parental authority is difficult of exercise. The children have grown up, and have a will and a mind of their own. What is occuring in the religious and political life of the world to-day is that which occurs in every household: The boys and girls become men and women, but the father and the mother will not see it; and the consequence is alienated affections and broken

hearts. Happy is that family in which the father and the mother grow young with the children, and receive from the lips of the children the wisdom of youth. What is true of the family is true of the churches. Happy is that church which listens to the children as they stand in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them and asking them questions. The age-long tragedy of the world is this misunderstanding between the young and the old. Well said the prophet: "Your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions."* Dreams and visions, past and future, old and young, —are not these the necessary stages in the evolution of life? He that is young to-day will be old to-morrow; he that is old to-day was young yesterday. Let the youth venerate his own old age in the old age of his father, and let the father respect his own youth in the youth of his son, and then shall the dream and the vision be one.

Existing political parties in the United States, like existing religious institutions, are smitten with age. Political parties are, in their nature, much shorter lived than religious organizations. They are created by the people for a definite purpose. When

*Joel, XI.: 28.

that purpose is accomplished the party ceases to be. Because of what it has done a party may live long in the affections of the people, and the people may use it for general purposes even after its special work is accomplished. But a party cannot live forever simply upon its history. It must do the present will of the people or it must die. The people will never forget the debt of gratitude which it owes to the old Democratic party for carrying it through the great bloodless revolution in the last century, by which political power was transferred from the few to the many. Speaking of this revolution in his "History of Political Parties in the State of New York," Mr. Hammond says: "I am now to approach a period in the political history of this state when an event occurred in a measure unprecedented in any other part of the world, but which, highly to the honor of this country, and fortunately for its inhabitants, is not unusual in the United States. The event to which I allude is a change by the will of a majority of the people, peaceably and constitutionally expressed, of some of the important and fundamental principles of the government. I say important and fundamental principles, because the sovereign power of creating

the Executive and one branch of the Legislative Department of the government was in a measure transferred from one class of men to another, and because the power of disposing of nearly the whole patronage of the state was actually changed, and I may add, that one branch of the law-making power was abolished, and the functions held and exercised by that department transferred to an individual. In past ages in every other country such a change could only have been effected by physical force; here it was brought about by moral power."*

It had been well for the Democratic party if it had gone on in its work of equalizing the political life of the people, and had given political rights to the laborer in the south as it gave political rights to the laborer in the north. By drawing an arbitrary line, and being one thing in the south and another thing in the north, the Democratic party became the cause of its own destruction. Its alliance with the slave power, being in flat contradiction to its own fundamental principles, caused it to lose the confidence of the people and they went out of it by the hundred thousand to form the Re-

*Hammond, History of Political Parties in the state of New York, vol. 2, chap. 1.

publican party, the purpose of which was to limit the area of slavery, and put in the way of gradual extinction. The Republican party was called upon to do more than it promised. It carried the nation through the great crisis of its history, and gave to it freedom and unity. For the work that it has done the people will always hold it in reverent affection. But the Civil War is over, and new issues are upon us. Neither the Republican nor the Democratic party is meeting the demands of the new age. Manhood suffrage for the white and personal liberty for the colored race are both achieved. But they have not been made effective. Of what good is manhood suffrage if its only use is to vote one set of office holders in and another set of office holders out; of what use is personal freedom if it cannot be exercised in speech and action. Manhood suffrage should be used for the enfranchisement of man from industrial thralldom and social disadvantage. Personal freedom should be used for the purpose of securing and maintaining personal dignity and personal power. The new age is upon us; the age of industrial freedom and social equality; the age that is to deliver man at last from bondage to man. In old time the princes and

nobles delivered themselves from the bondage to the King; claimed and acquired the right to share with him in the government of the state. More recently the middle class, the merchant and the lawyer, freed itself from dependence on the prince and the noble, and became dominant in the political life of the world. And now the great mass of the people who do the world's work are pressing forward to claim an effective place for themselves in the social and political economy of the nations. They are asking for themselves and their children a share in those privileges which hitherto have been the privilege of the few. They are demanding decent homes to be born and to die in and sufficient leisure for thought and for prayer. The miner in the darkness of the mine is dreaming of light, and the girl in the noise and ugliness of the factory is thinking of beauty and quiet. The people are moving, and the old organizations must move with them or perish. Serve or die is the stern decree of fate. If the churches exist largely for the purpose of supporting the clergy, and the political parties for the purpose of providing places for the politicians, then both churches and parties are doomed.

The church-state in America, which includes all parties and all churches, has done great things; but greater remain to be done. It has given political power to the people. But the people must now use that power to secure industrial opportunity and social betterment. We have learned how to produce, but not how to distribute. We have vast, fabulous wealth at one end of the social scale, and bare subsistence at the other. The forms of law are used to divert the earnings of the honest and industrious into the purse of the dishonest and the idle. Widows and orphans are beguiled into buying undigested securities which prove to be undigestible, and which rob the widow and the fatherless of their little all. To correct these abuses, and to call the nation back to its high and holy calling as a church-state whose duty it is to promote the general welfare, to secure domestic tranquillity, and above and before all to establish justice,— is the task to which the American people must set itself without delay.

We are upon the threshold of a movement that shall carry mankind to a higher stage of being. No one is satisfied with the present conditions. The rich are ashamed, and the poor are angered. The

time is at hand for preaching the gospel to the poor. We will build no more cathedrals or churches, if we can help it, until we have delivered the poor from the slum and the sweat shop. We will send no missionaries to the heathen to preach a Christ whose name we glorify, but whose teaching we despise. We will not ask the people to come to our churches until our churches are purified from a corrupt commercialism. When our Christian merchants close their stores at a decent hour on Saturday nights, then we can expect to have hearty worship on Sunday morning. When these same merchants pay proper wages to the girls and the women whom they employ, so that these same girls and women are in no danger of having to sell their souls to keep their bodies alive; when we have honesty in trade and open dealing in corporations,—why then, and not till then, will the people think of coming to the churches. What we need is a moral and spiritual reformation, and we need it at once. Our church-state is in danger. The abomination of desolation is in the Holy Place.

How shall we bring this reformation about? I hear you cry. Why in the simplest way in the world: Heed the words of the mayor of Rochester,

and go to the primary. Go first to the primary of your own heart, and see that no malign and sinister influence rules your will. See to it that you subject your own petty desires to the general good. Dare to speak the truth though so to speak cost you friends and place and power. If the primary of your heart be clean, then can you think of cleansing the city, the state, and the nation. Go to the primary of your home and bring up your children in the belief that man is more than money, and that property rights are always to be subject to personal rights. Then go to the primary of your ward, insist that the meeting shall be open and free, meet, not in a saloon or a barber shop, but in the assembly room of your schoolhouses; speak for decency and order and open discussion; demand of your alderman the same unblemished personal character that you would demand of your minister; let the man whom you send to a convention represent you, and not some outside sinister influence; make your primaries political schools for the discussion of national and state policies. If the old parties are corrupt then form a new party that will do the will of the people. Have large, wide, uplifting views for yourself, for your city, for your state and your

nation,—views befitting the high and holy religion of justice and mercy and truth.

And as for you, O ye unprivileged classes, who have been put off with words about trinities and unities, about incarnations and personalities, the worn-out terminology of the Greek dialectic, and have been told that to say these things is true religion,—know this that pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this: "To visit the fatherless and the widow in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world."

Know this, also, that some of us are not going to think so much of the heaven which lies before us as of the heaven we can leave behind us. After we are gone millions and millions will be born into our great church-state of America and we cannot bear to think that they will be born into a land of depraved ideals, of religious dissonance, and social discontent. Before we close our eyes in death we would like to see the promise of a better day, when men shall no longer make gain their god; when they shall no longer say one thing in the church and do another in the world; when they shall cease to quarrel about God, and try to obey Him; when the rich man shall not glory in his riches, nor the

strong man in his strength; when this earth shall be the home of a virtuous, happy, contented race of men and women; when all nations will be united in the religion of justice, mercy and truth, and have it as their mission to form a more perfect union, to establish justice, to insure domestic tranquillity, to promote the general welfare, and to secure the blessing of liberty to themselves and their children.

University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
305 De Neve Drive - Parking Lot 17 • Box 951388
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90095-1388
Return this material to the library from which it was borrowed.

30m-1, 63(D4743s8)476

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
A 001 021 466 6